

283070

JPRS-TAC-85-018

18 July 1985

19980828 108

## Worldwide Report

## ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

11  
158  
A08

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

18 July 1985

**WORLDWIDE REPORT  
ARMS CONTROL**

**CONTENTS**

**GENERAL**

USSR: UN Conventional-Arms Disarmament Symposium Closes (Moscow TASS, 1 Jun 85; Moscow PRAVDA, 6 Jun 85).....	1
Symposium Ends	1
Soviet, Western Views Contrasted, by N. Ognev	1
Soviet Envoy Addresses Conventional-Arms Disarmament Symposium (Moscow TASS, 29 May 85).....	3
Further Soviet Reports on UN Disarmament Commission Meeting (Moscow TASS, 17, 21 May 85; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 May 85).....	5
U.S. Attitude Criticized	5
Bloc Proposes Naval Arms Curb, by Yevgeniy Kachanov	6
Israeli on Naval Limits	7
Discussion of Space Militarization	8
Moscow Talk Show: SDI, SALT II, Delhi Declaration (Moscow Domestic Service, 16 Jun 85).....	9
Conflict Over SDI	9
SALT II Treaty	10
Gandhi on Arms Issues	11
Review of Soviet Book on Conventional-Arms Arms Control (G. Stashevsky; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 4, Apr 85).....	13
Gromyko Book Preface Notes USSR Peace Policy (Moscow TASS, 19 Jun 85).....	15

Canada: Contracts Let for Surveillance Satellite Studies (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 27 Apr, 1 May 85).....	17
Technological Feasibility Studies	17
Star Wars Link Denial	18
USSR Spokesman on Geneva Talks, U.S. Ties, Chemical Arms (Bratislava Domestic Service, 20 Jun 85).....	19
<b>Briefs</b>	
TASS on TU Disarmament Committee	21
<b>U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS</b>	
Moscow: No Progress Possible With Original U.S. Stand (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 31 May 85). .	22
USSR: Brandt, Craxi Talks With Soviet Leaders Assessed (Moscow NEW TIMES, No 24, Jun 85).....	24
Geneva Talks Discussed, by V. Kuznetsov	24
Brandt Visit 'Useful', by V. Ivanov	28
TASS Reports Group Meetings 11-20 June (Moscow TASS, various dates).....	30
Space Arms Group 11 June	30
Strategic Weapons Group 12 June	30
INF Group 13 June	30
Space Arms Group 18 June	30
Strategic Weapons Group 19 June	30
INF Group 20 June	31
UN Delegate Welcomes Geneva Arms Reduction Talks (Dhaka THE BANGLADESH TIMES, 10 May 85).....	32
<b>SPACE ARMS</b>	
TASS Cites U.S. Critics of SDI (Moscow TASS, 6, 7 Jun 85).....	34
Robert McNamara	34
Union of Concerned Scientists	34
TASS Contrasts U.S., Soviet Space Activities (Moscow TASS, 15 Jun 85).....	36
U.S. Space Plans May Cause 'Runaway Arms Race' (Moscow in English to North America, 11 Jun 85).....	38
TASS Hits Kampelman Remarks at Florence Seminar (Moscow TASS, 16 Jun 85).....	39

Moscow Hits U.S. Vote on UN Space Arms Resolution (Igor Charikov; Moscow Domestic Service, 17 Jun 85).....	40
Soviet Academician Criticizes U.S. Rationale for SDI (A. Kokoshin; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Jun 85).....	41
USSR: Further on June NATO Meeting in Portugal (Moscow International Service, 6 Jun 85; Moscow Television Service, 9, 10 Jun 85).....	44
SDI, SALT II Discussed, by Viktor Shlenov	44
Shultz Pressure on Allies	45
Resistance to U.S.	46
Moscow Broadcast to Britain on UK's SDI Role (Anatoliy Gan; Moscow in English to Great Britian and Ireland, 12 Jun 85).....	48
PRAVDA Interviews Gene Larocque on SDI (A. Tolkunov; Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Apr 85).....	50
PRAVDA Views West European Union's Failure To Endorse SDI (Yuriy Kharlanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Apr 85).....	53
More Soviet Reports of Foreign Opposition to SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates).....	55
European Opposition	55
UK Labor Party Executive	56
Gandhi Cited	56
Canadian Scientists Refuse Research	57
USSR Expert: Impenetrable Shield Not Possible (Moscow TASS, 18 Jun 85).....	58
USSR Scientists Against Space Militarization (Moscow TASS, 12 Jun 85).....	59
USSR Manual on International Space Law Reviewed (O. Gazeiko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 Jun 85).....	60
USSR's Zagladin Discusses SDI, European Security (Vadim Zagladin Interview; Paris LE MATIN, 10 Jun 85).....	62
Norwegian Ministry Official Denies NATO in Crisis Over SDI (Oddmund H. Hammerstad; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 24 May 85)	65
Canadian Defense Minister Denies Joint Plans With U.S. (Jim Robb; Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 30 May 85).....	68

<b>Opposition Expressed to Star Wars Participation</b>	
(Ottawa THE WEEKEND CITIZEN, 25 May 85; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 14, 31 May 85).....	70
Government-Sponsored Committee, by David Lord	70
University Scientists, Engineers, by Stephen Strauss	71
Liberal Task Force Hearings, by Donn Downey	72
<b>Canada: No Decision on Star Wars Participation Yet</b>	
(Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 7, 10 May 85).....	73
Prime Minister's Response, by Joel Ruimy	73
Foreign Minister's Statement	74
<b>Green Paper Sparks Controversy on Star Wars Issue</b>	
(Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 15, 20 May 85; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 17 May 85).....	75
Government Green Paper	75
Committee Participation Refusal, by Jeff Sallot	77
Clark Remarks	78
<b>Australian Officials Reiterate SDI Objection</b>	
(Melbourne Overseas Service, 12, 14 Jun 85).....	79
Foreign Minister Hayden	79
Defense Minister Beazley	79
<b>Japanese Prime Minister, EC Official Discuss SDI</b>	
(Tokyo KYODO, 17 Jun 85).....	80
<b>Briefs</b>	
Australian Opposition Hits SDI Decision	81
Japan Said Interested in Eureka	81
Japan, Belgium Confer on SDI	82
<b>SALT/START ISSUES</b>	
<b>USSR: Reagan SALT II Decision Hides Intention To Drop Treaty</b>	
(Various sources, various dates).....	83
Open or Covert Renunciation Foreseen	83
'Crawling Out' of Agreement	84
Weekly Talk Show 14 June	85
Aimed at Misleading Public	89
To 'Disinform Public'	90
Warnke Criticism Cited	92
'Keeping Allies, Senate Quiet'	92
Continuing Anti-SALT Campaign Seen	94
U.S. Violations, Diktat	94
'Cover Up True Intentions'	96
Pershing II's Considered	97

Moscow Views U.S. Sincerity on SALT II Anniversary (Victor Levin; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Jun 85).....	99
TASS Reports on U.S. Plans for MX Missile (Moscow TASS, 19 Jun 85).....	100
House Votes Cuts	100
Perle Statement Cited	100
TASS Sees Evidence of U.S. First-Strike Preparations (Moscow TASS, 16 Jun 85).....	101
TASS Hits Rowny Statement in ICBM Cuts Proposal (Moscow TASS International Service, 10 Jun 85).....	103
Moscow Surveys Soviet Proposals Since SALT II (Moscow World Service, 11 Jun 85).....	105
TASS Reports Australian Backing for SALT II Compliance (Moscow TASS, 7 Jun 85).....	107
Finland's Leading Paper Applauds U.S. for Holding Salt Limits (Editorial; Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 13 Jun 85).....	108
Chinese Media Views Controversy Over SALT II (Zhang Dezhen; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 14 Jun 85).....	110
<b>Briefs</b>	
Standing Consultative Commission Agreement	112
TASS Reports Minuteman Test	112
TASS on B-1 Bomber Operation	112
TASS on Pacific Rocket Launches	113
<b>INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES</b>	
USSR 'Forced' To Respond to U.S. SLCM Deployment (Moscow World Service, 18 Jun 85).....	114
TASS: U.S. 'Brainwashing' Dutch MP's Into Accepting Missiles (Moscow TASS, 8 Jun 85).....	116
Dutch Paper Views Soviet SS-20 Moratorium (Editorial; Rotterdam NRC Handelsblad, 4 Jun 85).....	117
Canadian Supreme Court Dismisses Anti-Cruise Missile Case (Montreal International Service, 9 May 85).....	118
<b>CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE</b>	
TASS Reports Debate on Non-Use-of-Force Proposal (Moscow TASS, 14 Jun 85).....	119

## CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Soviet Delegate Israelyan Cited  
(Moscow TASS, 20 Jun 85)..... 120

## MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

Czech Chief Negotiator Criticizes NATO Stance  
(Paris AFP, 13 Jun 85)..... 122

### Briefs

New Italian Delegation Head ..... 123  
CSSR Blames West ..... 123

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Further Soviet Comment on U.S. Binary-Arms Decision  
(Various sources, various dates)..... 124

New Arms Race, by O. Lomov ..... 124  
Commission Report ..... 126  
Reagan Holds Closed Meeting ..... 126  
House Vote ..... 126  
War Against Civilians Seen ..... 127

Moscow: U.S. Disregards Geneva Chemical Weapons Protocol  
(Moscow Domestic Service, 17 Jun 85)..... 129

TASS: FRG, GDR Parties Call for Zone Free of Chemical Arms  
(Moscow TASS, 19 Jun 85)..... 130

GDR, FRG Parties Reach Chemical Disarmament Agreement  
(East Berlin ADN International Service, 19 Jun 85)..... 131

Joint Communique ..... 131  
Text of Draft Agreement ..... 132  
Press Conference ..... 135  
Further Explanation of Agreement ..... 138

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS Reports Bulgarian Call for Balkan Nuclear-Free Zone  
(Moscow TASS, 13 Jun 85)..... 140

Norwegian Nuclear Disarmament Group Pushing Nordic 'Zone'  
(Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 25 May 85)..... 141

New Zealand's Lange on ANZUS Support  
(Hong Kong Domestic Service, 16 Jun 85)..... 143

<b>Briefs</b>		
PRAVDA on Australian Antinuclear Bills		144
TASS on Manitoba NFZ		144
NUCLEAR TESTING		
U.S., USSR Views on Nuclear Weapons Tests Compared (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Jun 85).....	145	
TASS Sees U.S. Policies as Evidence of War Plans (Moscow TASS, 13 Jun 85).....	146	
Lange Criticizes French Nuclear Tests (Hong Kong AFP, 11 Jun 85).....	148	
<b>Briefs</b>		
PRAVDA Reports Nevada Tests		149
Stockholm Reports Soviet Test		149

GENERAL

USSR: UN CONVENTIONAL-ARMS DISARMAMENT SYMPOSIUM CLOSES

Symposium Ends

LD010917 Moscow TASS in English 0712 GMT 1 Jun 85

[Text] Mexico City June 1 TASS--TASS correspondent Valeriy Fesenko reports:

An interparliamentary symposium on conventional disarmament has ended here. That forum, convened on the initiative of the Interparliamentary Union and the United Nations, was attended by delegates from more than 60 countries and from a number of international organizations.

The symposium became the scene of extensive and open exchanges of opinion between parliamentarians and experts worried by the threat posed to world peace by the arms buildup and by the development of ever deadlier and more powerful types of armaments. Discussions showed that the parliaments of many countries considered limitations of conventional armaments to be a vital problem of disarmament along with ending the nuclear arms race and preventing its spread into space.

Speakers highly appreciated the numerous proposals aimed at limiting the conventional arms race that had been made during the past few years by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The symposium demonstrated that the address of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR "To the Peoples, Parliaments and Governments of All Countries" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War had evoked extensive responses from all over the world. The USSR, parliamentarians stressed, approaches seriously and responsibly all the talks on curbing the arms race and promoting disarmament and displays its goodwill and desire to cooperate constructively and to seek mutually acceptable solutions through dialogue.

Soviet, Western Views Contrasted

PM100957 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent N. Ognev under the general heading: "Good Will Is Needed"]

[Excerpts] Mexico City--The reaching of agreements aimed at reducing the risk of nuclear catastrophe is an urgent task of modern times, but mankind must not

close its eyes to the extreme danger posed by the buildup of stocks of conventional types of arms--this was the leitmotiv of the interparliamentary symposium on disarmament in the sphere of conventional types of arms held in the Mexican capital 28-31 May.

In recent years the trade in weapons has been turned into an industry. "Paradoxical as it may seem, the chief buyers are economically weak, developing states," Australian parliamentarian Richard Butler pointed out. Most frequently they do this under pressure from international arms dealers, among whom the United States plays first fiddle. Thus, actively fanning the hotbed of war in the Near East, Washington has sold weapons worth \$30 billion to that region over the past 10 years.

Delegates from socialist and a number of developing countries pointed to the need to formulate political and international legal criteria to provide guidance in determining in what situation and with regard to which recipients arms deliveries are valid and permissible.

Washington--the chief perpetrator of international tension and the initiator of the arms race--confined itself to sending to Mexico City a group of representatives of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, claiming that congressmen were "busy." Instead of speaking to the point and seeking efficient ways to limit the arms race, the U.S. Western allies tried at the symposium to develop a "numbers debate," essentially evading the problem of disarmament.

At the Mexico City meeting of parliamentarians the Soviet delegation put forward proposals to limit the trade in weapons, ban particularly destructive and new types of conventional weapons, renounce increases in military budgets, limit naval activity and reduce naval arms. These realistic proposals, as well as the other socialist states' position imbued with concern for peace and international security, elicited a positive response.

CSO: 5200/1266

GENERAL

SOVIET ENVOY ADDRESSES CONVENTIONAL-ARMS DISARMAMENT SYMPOSIUM

LD291354 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 29 May 85

[Text] Mexico City 29 May TASS--The conventional arms race undermines international security and hampers the development of relations between all countries of the world, said S. G. Mellbin (Denmark) at an inter-parliamentary symposium on disarmament in the sphere of conventional armaments, which is under way here. War conflicts with the use of conventional weapons have carried away millions of lives in the past decades, inflicted great destructions and threaten to grow into a nuclear catastrophe. The conventional arms race, said deputy U.N. Secretary-General on questions of disarmament Jan Martensson, swallows the lion's share of military expenditures, is a heavy burden on the shoulders of peoples of both developed and developing countires, it squanders huge resources which are needed for peaceful purposes.

General Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union Pio-Carlo Terenzio pointed to the parliamentarians' important role in curbing the conventional arms race and gradual reducing their stocks. May this symposium, he said, lay the beginning to the process of negotiations aimed at stopping the arms race and turning it back.

Advancement to limitation of conventional armanents and to real disarmament in the given sphere is practically feasible on the basis of the principle of equality and undiminished security, said the Soviet representative Oleg Bykov.

Limitation and reduction of armaments both nuclear and conventional, he said, is possible provided general equilibrium of the armed forces both with respect to strategic nuclear armaments and conventional armaments of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. All that disrupts equilibrium, particularly preparations of the U.S. Administration for "star wars", undermines possibilities of attaining an agreement on reduction of armaments, including conventional.

The Soviet representative drew the parliamentarians' attention to the USSR's initiatives in the sphere of disarmament that were set forth at the negotiations in Vienna, Stockholm and other forums. The Soviet Union, he stressed, favors mutual reduction of troops, mutual renunciation of the use of both conventional and nuclear force, it favors turning whole regions of our planet into peace zones.

CSO: 5200/1180

GENERAL

FURTHER SOVIET REPORTS ON UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION MEETING

U.S. Attitude Criticized

LD172100 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 17 May 85

[Text] New York 17 May TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The U.S. has openly opposed the efforts of the UN aimed at the prevention of a nuclear war and the curbing of the arms race. It follows from a U.S. statement contained in a report published by the UN Commission for Disarmament which deals with the UN role in the sphere of disarmament. [sentence as received] In this document Washington expressed profound discontent over the fact that in the past several years the UN devoted ever more time to disarmament problems. In its opinion, the "volume of efforts" that the international community devotes to this key problem of today is too great. The White House is also dissatisfied over the great number of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on disarmament problems, as well as over the fact that the overwhelming majority of countries vote for them.

The U.S. diplomacy which set itself the task of undermining the efforts of the UN, strongly recommends to critically analyze the quality and quantity of resolutions on the disarmament problem, to strictly limit the discussion of this problem, to forbid many UN committees and specialized bodies to deal with it. Washington which openly advocates the doctrine of "permissibility" of a nuclear war and of a first nuclear strike would be especially willing to undermine the struggle of the world community for the removal of the nuclear threat. It is not accidental that the U.S. statement contains the truly sacriligious attempt to put on the same footing nuclear and conventional armaments, a nuclear and conventional war, under the pretext of criticism of some "disbalance" of resolutions of the General Assembly which allegedly confines itself exclusively to nuclear disarmament problems.

The obvious irritation of the U.S. over the role played by the UN is quite understandable, since its aggressive policy which runs counter to the aspirations of mankind is brought under stinging criticism at

this forum, and the isolation of the U.S. there is growing. At the 39th session of the General Assembly during the voting on the resolutions it adopted the opinion of the U.S. delegation was at variance with that of the overwhelming majority of states in four cases out of five. During the voting on the package of the most important resolutions on disarmament (17 drafts) the U.S. voted in favor only once.

Bloc Proposes Naval Arms Curb

LD182234 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 May 85

[*"Latest News"* commentary by Yevgeniy Kachanov]

[Text] The socialist countries have undertaken a new peace initiative at the UN session of the Disarmament Commission. Representatives of Bulgaria, the GDR, and the Soviet Union put forward for the commission's discussion with the General Assembly resolution on this issue. Here is a *"Latest News"* commentary with Yevgeniy Kachanov:

From the start I should say that the struggle for limiting and reducing the level of military activity and military confrontation in the regions of the world's oceans, where the possibility of conflict situations arising is not likely, is one of the major spheres of the foreign policy activity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The topicality of these efforts is becoming more obvious in light of the fact that the United States and its aggressive military bloc allies do not conceal their intention to lay special stress on intensive use of their naval power and, for this purpose, to take practical steps. It is clear that this is done in order to secure for the United States a dominant position in the world's oceans and to make the achievement of Washington's imperialist objectives in various regions of the world easier. Thus, the change of strategic objectives and a return to what was once called gunboat diplomacy and what can now be called, I would say, the diplomacy of carriers of missile warships.

More and more often Washington sends its warships or even entire fleets to the shores of countries where events do not satisfy the creators of U.S. policy--it could be Lebanon, Nicaragua, or the Indian Ocean countries. And, of course, the world community is most concerned over the accelerated rate of equipping U.S. ships and submarines with nuclear missiles.

The socialist countries confront this dangerous course with their principled policy of reducing the level of military confrontation in the world's ocean. As far back as 5 years ago, in May 1980, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states put forward concrete proposals on this question. The Soviet Union's memorandum on limiting naval activity is widely known, too. It was

put forward for examination by the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament. Now again, the socialist countries are raising this important issue. The joint document of Bulgaria, the GDR, and the USSR proposes, in particular, that states should refrain from any activity leading to the acceleration of the naval arms race. It is proposed that special attention should be paid to warships carrying nuclear weapons and to examine the question of their withdrawal from certain regions of the world's oceans and to discuss measures concerning naval bases on foreign territories.

Carrying out certain regional measures could also have a positive effect. They include converting the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean into peace zones and strengthening security in the Persian Gulf region. The aim of all these proposals is to prepare the conditions for direct transition to talks on mutual limitation of naval activity and on reducing naval armaments. It is now the other side's turn.

#### Israelyan on Naval Limits

LD211127 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 21 May 85

[Text] New York 21 May TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev writes:

At the continuing session of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament here the delegates of Czechoslovakia, Cyprus, the GDR, Argentina and Vietnam attracted the international community's attention to the fact that the United States and other NATO countries are initiating a new round of the naval arms race, including naval nuclear arms. Thus, by number of nuclear warheads the share of the Navy in the strategic "triad" of the United States exceeds 50 percent.

In the post-war years the United States and other NATO countries sent their ships and Marines on more than a hundred occasions to suppress the national-liberation movement, take part in armed conflicts or to stage military provocations. As it was stressed by the Bulgarian representative B. Konstantinov, the imperialist forces use their navies to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

The solution of the set of questions connected with the limitation of the naval arms race remains deadlocked to this day because of the position taken by the United States and a number of its allies, stated the Soviet representative Viktor Israelyan. The importance and significance of this problem demand its speediest study and solution. It is necessary to determine as quickly as possible both concrete steps to limit naval activity and concrete questions of holding talks to formulate them.

These measures, he noted, include the creation in the Mediterranean Sea of zone free from nuclear-missile weapons, a zone of stable peace and cooperation in that region, the limitation of military activity in

the Indian Ocean area, the application of similar measures to the Pacific Ocean, the limitation of areas in which missile-firing submarines are on patrol to mutually agreed-upon lines.

Also remaining on the table is the Soviet proposal for all states, whose ships sail on the Indian Ocean, not to wait for the convocation of an international conference on the Indian Ocean and to refrain from all steps capable of complicating the situation in the region. The Soviet representative said that it would be possible to start restraining the naval arms race by reaching an agreement on the non-expansion of naval activity in areas of conflict or tension. All major naval powers and other interested states should take part in the talks on the limitation of naval activity and naval armaments, he stressed.

#### Discussion of Space Militarization

LD212323 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 21 May 85

[Text] New York 22 May TASS--The termination of the arms race on the earth and its prevention in outer space is the call of time. This has been stated by most of the participants in a debate at a session of the UN Disarmament Commission which started the discussion of the question connected with the implementation of the declaration on the proclamation of the 80s to be the second disarmament decade. Reports of representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, Colombia and a number of other countries stressed a special importance of preventing the militarization of outer space.

Washington tries to use the term of "Strategic Defense Initiative" for covering up its striving to create the potential for delivering the first nuclear blow and go unpunished, to upset the existing military balance, Kazimierz Tomaszewski, representative of Poland, pointed out. This is why the prevention of the arms race in outer space should become the first-priority task of the second disarmament decade.

In the face of the enormous threat which is posed to mankind by military-space ventures, the Soviet Union believes that it is necessary to stop the arms race on the earth and to prevent it in outer space, said the Soviet representative Viktor Israelyan.

CSO: 5200/1180

GENERAL

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: SDI, SALT II, DELHI DECLARATION

LD162046 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 16 Jun 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, NOVOSTI political observer, Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD, and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, All-Union Radio and Central Television political observer]

[Excerpt]

Conflict Over SDI

[Zholkver] But I think that when we talk about acute contradictions and clashes between the Common Market and the United States, or within the Common Market itself, particularly in connection with the entry of Spain and Portugal, which aggravates the contradictions even further, we should note the common denominator -- the interests of the major West European and U.S. monopolies, both in the social sphere, that is, in the general struggle against the working people, and, I would say, in the military-political sphere. They are united by the common desire for record profits, mainly from military production and, not least, from the production of especially expensive types of weapons for the military-space business.

[Kolchanov] Yes, naturally. Let's take the position of Great Britain, for example, as regards the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, or rather, the plans for producing space strike weapons, which now form one of the major issues in U.S.-West European relations. Great Britain, as we can see, is hesitating. On the one hand, common sense indicates that they should say no to this new stage in the arms race, and there are sober-minded people in Britain who say as much, even in the prime minister's political entourage; and on the other hand, many of Britain's industrialists and monopolists are concerned not to miss out on the benefits. And, I would say, financiers looking for a good investment are very, very actively trying to urge the British Government into taking the very imprudent step of participating in the strategic initiative. We can see the same happening in other countries, such as the FRG.

[Zholkver] Just last week, a large group of so-called West German experts, consisting of government representatives and representatives from major industrial and research firms, visited Washington for talks on precisely this subject, possible participation in space weapons production. As for Great Britain, Spartak Ivanovich, just the other day, that country was host to General Abrahamsen, the head of the U.S. military space program, who had talks with Heseltine, head of the British war department [as heard], about Britain's participation in producing, for example, so-called electromagnetic guns for use in space. So here the monopolies' common interest in getting a nice

fat piece of the cake and hefty profits from space weapon production is quite obvious.

[Kolchanov] Both the community of interests and, at the same time, the selfishness of their interests, are evident.

Each is trying to grab his own piece of the cake, but at the same time, the United States, while wishing to harness the technological and industrial potential of the other capitalist countries to the development work, has not the slightest intention of sharing the cake.

#### SALT II Treaty

[Zholkver] Yes, that's quite correct. The figures show that U.S. monopolies will get the biggest share of the cake. This is what I read in DER SPIEGEL: the Boeing aviation concern has already received military space orders from the Pentagon worth \$364 million; Lockheed, another aviation concern, \$240 million; Douglas, again an aviation concern, \$237 million. The interests of these monopolies are supported by Pentagon chief Weinberger, who is so persistently campaigning for preparation for "star wars." At the same time, it is quite impossible not to notice that by doing this, the United States and the Washington administration are violating a whole range of international statutes, treaties, and agreements, including some signed with the USSR, such as the Soviet-American ABM Treaty. We happen right now to be on the eve of the 6th anniversary of the signing of the SALT II treaty in Vienna, and although it was not ratified by the United States, they have stated that they will adhere to the treaty's provisions. Is that not so, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] At that time, we indeed had occasion, Aleksandr Vladimirovich, to be in Vienna together 6 years ago, and how many good and true words were said on the importance of that treaty, including from the U.S. side. But, I also recall that 10 weeks later, I was in the United States for another reason and discovered what a campaign had arisen there to discredit the treaty, to discredit President Carter, who had appended his signature. This treaty ran counter to the plans, those schemes of seizing upon new weapons systems, of arriving at the level of military superiority, which the right wing, so-called ultraconservative circles in the United States, had already come up with.

[Kolchanov] Spartak Aleksandrovich, if at that time they had declared the treaty to be anathema, then a few years later, especially under the present U.S. Administration, they have already moved from anathema to direct violation of the treaty, violating at one and the same time both the 1972 ABM Treaty and the protocol that was added to it, which is full of extremely important and substantial content. Well, the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles is a direct violation of SALT II.

[Beglov] Of the spirit of SALT II.

[Kolchanov] The production of long-range cruise missiles is a direct violation.

[Beglov] This is a violation of the protocol that provided for the continuity of the process; that is, the conclusion of new agreements which would impose a ban on long-range missiles and exclude them from the arsenals. This dual game is connected with a subterfuge of the present administration, which consists of attempting to move all the blame from the guilty on to the innocent, on to the Soviet Union -- in other words, while continuing to violate, to accuse the Soviet Union, or while accusing the Soviet Union, to continue violating. This was the scheme of President Reagan when

he made the gesture on Monday [10 June] to the effect that the United States will continue to adhere to, and even accordingly take certain measures in the framework of the limits of that treaty; what is in mind is that in the fall the United States will launch the new submarine Alaska of the Trident system, a submarine armed with 24 missiles, each of them containing 10 warheads, and each nuclear warhead four times as powerful as the Hiroshima one.

That is why all this engendered such a firm rebuff from the Soviet Union when it was stated that our country would not permit the United States to dictate which obligations would be observed and which not. The Soviet Union will draw the appropriate conclusions from all this dictated by the interests of its security and the security of its allies.

[Zholkver] At the same time, it seems to me that it should also be noted that the more sober-minded circles in the United States itself and in Western Europe are realizing what a dangerous road the United States is embarking on this case. And it is interesting -- I saw an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES noting that three of the five members of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the chief himself, expressed themselves in favor of the President's not fully renouncing the SALT-II treaty concluded with the Soviet Union since the United States may lose more than it gains. It is hinted fairly transparently in the article that the Soviet Union may take corresponding counter measures, and there is no guarantee at all that such a violation of the SALT II treaty would enhance the security of the United States. Incidentally, it is surely interesting that the U.S. Senate voted to call on President Reagan to continue observing the provisions of the SALT II treaty by 90 votes to 5.

[Kolchanov] This is as far as intra-American relations are concerned, but you know that quite recently the so-called spring meetings of the leading NATO organs were held, and in Portugal there was a session of the foreign ministers of the NATO member-countries. What is interesting is that all the European participant countries of the bloc came out in favor of Washington's observing the previously concluded treaty for the same reasons that we mentioned just now. Words fail me in describing the irresponsible attitude to treaties concluded by the United States, which has now reached such heights that it is indeed causing indignation even among its closest allies. I shall explain my thought by returning to the treaty on antimissile defence of 1972. I remind you of Article 5 of that treaty, which expressly forbids the creation, testing, and deployment of systems and components of antimissile defense that are space-based.

[Beglov] There is another article, Article 13, of the treaty, which says that both sides undertake to agree on measures between them that would lead to strengthening the basis of the treaty.

#### Gandhi on Arms Issues

[Zholkver] It must be said that this strengthening of security is also being demanded by the representatives of other countries. At present, as you know, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India is a guest in the United States. He had a meeting with a group of U.S. scientists, at which he sharply condemned the plans to create space weapons in the United States, precisely because, as he put it, they move the world toward the brink of the abyss of nuclear war. Incidentally, he resolutely rejected as groundless the assertions that this program has a defensive nature, declaring straight out that it is a weapons development.

[Beglov] Yes, Rajiv Gandhi's current visit to the United States draws a comparison, as it were, between the two courses of world policy. We know that Prime Minister Rajiv

Gandhi recently visited the Soviet Union and what was discussed. It was about ensuring the strengthening and developing of all possibilities and initiatives that would lead to the consolidation of peace and to preventing the arms race. Rajiv Gandhi represents the group of states -- very influential, six states from five continents -- which have already twice formulated their common platform and have called on the nuclear powers for an immediate cessation to the arms race, for an immediate start to the reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals.

[Zholkver] You mean the Delhi Declaration?

[Beglov] The Delhi Declaration of January this year. But, after all, only the Soviet Union replied positively and encouragingly, I would say, to this declaration, and expressed its readiness to go along the road designated in the declaration. In receiving Rajiv Gandhi in Washington, the U.S. Administration cannot even boast of a simple, so to speak, expression of understanding of the essence, of the spirit and importance of this declaration. Finally there is the question of U.S. interference in India's internal affairs and its encirclement of India, the use of Pakistan as a springboard, the slighting of the Indian proposal to transform the Indian Ocean into a peace zone.

[Zholkver] It must be said that Rajiv Gandhi himself, speaking in the United States, stressed that he had recently been to Moscow, and that the Soviet leadership had adopted a very positive attitude toward the Delhi Declaration. The Soviet Union, said Rajiv Gandhi word for word, speaking in the United States, is displaying the readiness to disarm. As we see, this cannot be said of the United States, and I think that in concluding our conversation, it ought to be emphasized that precisely the material of the conference just held at the CPSU Central Committee on problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress stresses yet again that the Soviet Union is engaged in peaceful, creative labor. We have a lot ahead of us to do -- not easy, but wide-scale, innovative tasks -- and it is only possible to solve this whole complex of tasks facing our people and our party, of course, in conditions of peace. The struggle to maintain and consolidate peace, to prevent the danger of nuclear war, is still the main thing in the foreign policy of our party and our country. Here we shall end our conversation at the roundtable. Thank you, comrades, for taking part in it. Thank you, comrade listeners, for your attention. All the best.

CSO: 5200/1262

GENERAL

REVIEW OF SOVIET BOOK ON CONVENTIONAL-ARMS ARMS CONTROL

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 4, Apr 85 pp 150-151

[Review by G. Stashevsky of book by I. P. Blishchenko, "Conventional Arms and International Law," Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya Publishers, Moscow, 1984, 216 pages]

[Text] This monograph is a comprehensive study of problems relating to the prohibition or limitation of the use of conventional weapons, a theme that is highly relevant now that the United States, no longer content with the unprecedented build-up of nuclear weapons and the deployment of new, first-strike nuclear missiles near the borders of socialist states, is going out of its way to start a new round of the conventional arms race under the Rogers Doctrine, which is named after the NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. As a step towards implementing this doctrine, the armies of NATO countries are to be equipped with the latest highly-destructive long-range weapons systems.

The author demonstrates that highly-destructive conventional weapons used on a wide scale may cause heavy casualties among the civilian population and enormous destruction that can only be compared with the effects of nuclear weapons. "Besides", the author remarks, "each armed conflict (a so-called local war) fought with conventional arms increases the likelihood of a nuclear war breaking out" (p. 7), and may become the prelude to a worldwide catastrophe.

It is for these reasons that efforts must continue to limit, and ultimately ban, the use of conventional weapons. As the Communist Party of the USSR declared at its 26th Congress in 1981, the Soviet Union is ready to "negotiate limitation of weapons of all types." The USSR has affirmed on numerous occasions its readiness to limit, ban, and eliminate any weapons on a mutually acceptable basis and on the principles of equality and equal security.

The book provides a detailed analysis of the principal areas in which the Soviet Union is directing its efforts: reduction of the military budgets of states, restriction of the arms trade, limitation and reduction of conventional weapons on a regional basis, etc. These areas are examined from the perspective of the generally recognized principles and norms of modern

international law, which oblige states to show restraint in the use of conventional arms.

The author concentrates on international humanitarian law which has a direct bearing on the means and methods of combat operations. He set forth the Soviet conception of international humanitarian law, which he presents as a branch of modern international law. He singles out three principal aspects of humanitarian law: international legal norms covering human rights and freedoms in peace time; legal norms relating to the observance of basic human rights and freedoms in armed conflicts; and legal norms aimed at halting the arms race, and limiting and banning the use of various types of weapons. "The existing international treaties and agreements," the author points out, "are based on the premise that considerations of humanism, a love of one's fellow men, and social awareness must be given priority over considerations of military expediency" (p. 99).

The author denounces the policies of US imperialism, which commits arbitrary acts in the international arena trampling the sovereignty of independent states, as was the case with the US military intervention in Grenada, or encouraging other states, such as Israel and the Republic of South Africa, to commit acts of aggression and plunder. These acts are equally qualified as international crimes by current international law.

A special chapter is devoted to the prohibition or limitation of the use of individual types of conventional weapons, that is, weapons that are not in the mass-destruction class. It examines key international legal documents which have been adopted in this area, in particular, the convention on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons, and the protocols attached to it. It also demonstrates the Soviet Union's significant contribution to the drafting of this major international document.

The last chapter looks at guarantees safeguarding peace and the security of states. These guarantees are closely related to the limitation and prohibition of both nuclear and conventional weapons. The author emphasizes that "an approximate balance in arms and armed forces between NATO states and member-states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization is an important material condition that guarantees the security of nations..." (p. 165), and that any attempt at breaking the existing parity would aggravate international tensions and push the world to the brink of a destructive war.

For all its well-researched approach to the theme, the book is not without drawbacks. In the first place, the problem of arms and armed forces reductions in Central Europe receives only scant attention, although many more details could be added within the format of this book. The Soviet Union's efforts to achieve a ban on the use and threat of force in international relations also needs to be shown on a broader scale.

In general, this book will be of interest to experts in international law and to all readers studying present-day international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1985

English Translation Copyright: Progress Publishers, 1985

CSO: 5200/1182

GENERAL

GROMYKO BOOK PREFACE NOTES USSR PEACE POLICY

LD191355 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Excerpt] Lisbon June 19 TASS--A formal ceremony of the presentation of a book by Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, took place at the "Portugal-USSR" society today. The book put out in Portuguese by the Avante Publishers, contains Andrey Gromyko's statements, speeches and articles of the 1975-1984 period.

The ceremony was attended by notable Portuguese politicians and public figures, F. Melo, director of the Avante Publishers, and M. Nevis, president of the "Portugal-USSR" society, stressed the importance of the publication to the popularisation of the Soviet Union's foreign policy of peace among the Portuguese people.

Andrey Gromyko says in his address to the Portuguese readers that the book concentrates on the illustration of the consistency of the Soviet Union's course of supporting the peoples standing up for their freedom and independence, of tirelessly struggling for peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, of removing seats of tension and conflicts, of achieving an end to the arms race, of promoting disarmament and of strengthening world peace.

The basic directions, goals and principles of the Soviet Union's activity on the international scene have been characterised by continuity ever since the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917 and the proclamation of Lenin's decree on peace, the first foreign policy act of the Soviet state. In the present-day world situation, which has during the past years been aggravated because of the course assumed by certain forces in the West to escalate the arms race, to achieve military superiority and to whip up international tension, the Soviet Union proceeds from the assumption that there is no more important task than the task of removing the increased threat of nuclear conflict.

The best solution of that problem, we believe, would be the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons all over the world. But we stand also for partial measures leading towards that goal, such as an agreement on reducing nuclear armaments, the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones and other appropriate steps. As regards Europe, where nuclear confrontation has been growing dramatically since new U.S. missiles began to be deployed, the Soviet Union stands for the complete riddance of the European Continent of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, naturally, on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security for the Warsaw Treaty countries and NATO members.

The Soviet Union is opposed in principle to the use of nuclear weapons, Andrey Gromyko continues. This is forcefully corroborated by its obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and by its appeal to all the other nuclear powers which have not yet assumed such an obligation to do so. The USSR has also stated that it will never use nuclear weapons against those states which renounce the production and acquisition of these weapons and which do not have them in their territories. And wouldn't the implementation of the socialist countries' proposal of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force in relations between the Warsaw Treaty countries and the members of the North Atlantic alliance help dispel mutual fears? If states, regardless of whether they participate in military alliances or are neutral and nonaligned, assumed the obligation not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional armaments against one another, in other words, not to use force, it could only be welcomed.

These and other major proposals were tabled by the Soviet Union also at the Stockholm Conference. They were put forward in conjunction with certain confidence-building measures in the military field, Andrey Gromyko says in his address to the Portuguese readers.

In view of the increased threat of the spread of the arms race into space, the Soviet Union has made repeated initiatives aimed at preventing the militarisation of space weapons in their totality was welcomed throughout the world with approval and hope. [sentence as received].

In this way, Andrey Gromyko says, we demonstrated anew our desire to look for and work out most radical solutions which would mean the lessening of the level of nuclear confrontation both on a regional, European, and on a global scale and make it possible to advance towards the complete prohibition and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

I would like to voice one more idea, the author continues. Representatives of smaller states sometimes say that the problems of ensuring peace, averting war and reducing armaments, especially nuclear armaments, are the domain of the great powers whereas medium and smaller countries should only watch these activities from the sidelines. In our view, it is an obvious underestimation of their role. No state regardless of its size, social system or ideology can nowadays stay aloof from active participation in the solution of major questions of our time, the questions of war and peace. We stand for all states, big and small alike, acting hand in hand in this matter.

CSO: 5200/1266

GENERAL

CANADA: CONTRACTS LET FOR SURVEILLANCE SATELLITE STUDIES

Technological Feasibility Studies

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 27 Apr 85 p A4

[Text]

The federal government has taken the first substantial steps toward involvement in the controversial North Warning air-defence system by commissioning two major studies into the technological feasibility of space-based radar surveillance satellites, The Canadian Press has learned.

Two contracts filed by the Department of National Defence for scientific contracts to guide the North Warning system have been commissioned, valued at about \$950,000 each. North Warning is to replace the aging Distant Early Warning system, usually known as the DEW Line.

Two Canadian-led consortia will carry out the studies with participation by specialist companies in the United States. One is led by Spar Aerospace Ltd. of Toronto and the other by Canadian Astronautics Ltd. of Ottawa.

Spar vice-president Chris Trump said the studies will identify the technology needs of the new system and determine what kinds of technology are already available. After the preliminary studies are completed, more work will be needed to identify the kinds of critical technology that have yet to be perfected.

Although many surveillance satellites exist now, the new North Warning devices will be far more accurate in the observation of low-flying objects.

"These satellites will observe low-flying aircraft and missiles, especially ground-huggers such as the cruise missile," Trump said in an interview.

Trump said the "space-based surveillance radar concept and feasibility study" will examine what technology is available now, what needs to be developed in Canada over the next 10 years, and the means of putting the critical technology together to make the system work.

Canada will contribute \$600 million toward building the \$1.6 billion North Warning system. It will also pay the lion's share of operating costs.

David Keyes, who supervises space science contracts for the Department of Supply and Services, said identical contracts were awarded to Spar and Canadian Astronautics so that the Defence Department could get ideas from a variety of sources.

"It's basically a brainstorming session," Keyes said of the two contracts. "We hope that by letting two contracts we will get twice as many good ideas."

Star Wars Link Denial

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 1 May 85 p A3

[Text]

Defence Minister Erik Nielsen denied Tuesday that federal contracts for research into space-based radar surveillance are related to the U.S. Star Wars space weapons system or to the new North Warning radar system for the Arctic.

Nielsen told the Commons the research contracts awarded to two Canadian-led ventures are no more than explorations into the general idea of space-based surveillance of Canadian territory.

"That's all they are, contracts for exploration of what's involved," Nielsen told New Democrat leader Ed Broadbent.

A Defence Department spokesman said there is no link between

the research and current plans to refurbish the Distant Early Warning system, commonly known as the DEW Line. But Capt. Kevin Carle did not rule out the satellites being eventually connected to North Warning or to other defence systems.

He said the department wants to know from the research whether there will be a future requirement for military surveillance satellites and whether Canada has any immediate requirements for financing of new technology.

He said the 15-month studies, worth \$950,000 each, by Spar Aerospace Ltd. of Toronto and Canadian Astronautics Ltd. of Ottawa may provide the groundwork for "a follow-on to the North Warning system."

CSO: 5220/08

GENERAL

USSR SPOKESMAN ON GENEVA TALKS, U.S. TIES, CHEMICAL ARMS

LD201753 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1630 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is currently on a working visit to the CSSR. Bohumil Horak has taken this opportunity to ask him for an interview.

[Begin recording] [Horak speaking in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva have been going on for 6 full months, but there has been no progress. In your view, what would contribute to getting the Geneva negotiations out of this deadlock?

[Lomeyko speaking in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] To put it briefly, what matters is being interested and demonstrating political will. If the U.S. side demonstrates interest in achieving an agreement on the principle of equality and equal security, then the Geneva negotiations will move from their deadlock. The first round of these talks and the beginning of the second round showed that the U.S. Administration sadly lacks this interest. This is the chief problem of the whole talks.

[Horak] How do you evaluate the current condition and perspectives of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Lomeyko] It is of course not possible to describe them as satisfactory, but I would like to express the hope that Washington would understand that when Soviet-U.S. relations are bad, the whole international atmosphere suffers, and thus the U.S. side also loses out. This is because the world is interlinked. For us the relative balance of force between the Soviet Union and the United States is of fundamental importance. This is so because it guarantees international security, the security of the USSR and that of our allies. If you like, it guarantees that peace is preserved. We would like to think that in the United States itself the views of sober-minded politicians will prevail; that is those politicians who will eventually understand that Soviet-U.S. relations can further develop only on the principal of equality, equal security, and mutually advantageous cooperation.

[Horak] Some Western mass media speculate about a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan.

[Lomeyko] Yes, this is being widely mentioned. But too much attention is being paid to a question which is in fact quite clear -- both sides have agreed that they are interested in such a meeting. At the moment, negotiations are under way through diplo-

matic channels as to when and where the meeting will take place. It's not simple. I would like to emphasize that some people, in Washington in particular, imagine the forthcoming meeting as an event where everything will be resolved. However, this question is rather broader than that. It is not that relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are bad because the leading representatives of both countries have not met. They have not met because poor relations exist between the Soviet Union and the United States, and poor relations exist between them because Washington is taking a course aimed at attaining military supremacy. We have always considered these summit meetings very important. They help to achieve mutual understanding when good political will exists on both sides. If they are willing to solve questions with us in Washington on the basis of equality, a summit meeting would help this.

[Horak] Yesterday at an international press conference in Bonn, representatives of a group of experts of the SED and the SPD put forward a joint proposal for the creation of a chemical weapons free zone in Europe. How do you evaluate this step?

[Lomeyko] Chemical weapons are at least enemy number two. During nuclear equality they could even become enemy number one. The Soviet union has been and is for a complete ban on chemical weapons and their complete removal. The Americans do put forward various proposals and express willingness to talk but they always concentrate on the problem of control. In other words, they maintain that it is necessary to solve all the formal questions connected with control. We believe that although control is important, the most important thing is to begin concrete talks on reducing the number of chemical weapons. This is why yesterday's SED-SPD initiative is useful. If other countries do not put forward any preconditions, if they accept the idea that it is necessary to begin talks on the basis of destroying the stockpiles of chemical weapons and not adding others, not importing binary and other forms of chemical weapons to Europe, then I think we will take the first step to making Europe free from this dark specter of death. [end recording]

CSO: 5200/1266

GENERAL

BRIEFS

TASS ON TU DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE--Geneva June 15 TASS--An open meeting of the International Trade Union Committee on Peace and Disarmament (Dublin Committee) took place here today under the keynote "Trade Unions: Responsibility for the Preservation of Life on Earth." The meeting was attended by representatives of about 30 countries and 6 international organizations. The discussion confirmed anew far-ranging worry over the dangerous world situation caused primarily by the arms race and by the threat of its being spread into outer space. Speakers from European, Asian and African countries stressed that the struggle for peace and disarmament was inseparable from the struggle for the vital interests of the working people and for social progress. The trade unions already are one of the motive forces of the anti-war movement but it is necessary to achieve full unity of the actions of all the working people to prevent deadly nuclear war. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 15 Jun 85]

CSO: 5200/1266

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW: NO PROGRESS POSSIBLE WITH ORIGINAL U.S. STAND

LD010431 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 31 May 85

[Text] The Soviet Union and the United States have begun the second round of their talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. The key to the success of these talks is outlined by Viktor Vasilyev, our political observer. This is what he writes:

[Announcer-read] In sending its delegation to the talks, Washington expressed its hope for substantial progress, but added that for this the Russians would have to change their position. For their part the Americans announced, after President Reagan had briefed the chief negotiator, Max Kampelman, that there would be no change in their position.

The first round showed that if the Americans insist on their original stand progress at the talks will be impossible. If the talks have as yet produced no positive results, it is on account of the American intransigence. The American delegation has tried to bypass the agreement reached at the Gromyko-Shultz meeting in January. The sides then agreed in plain terms that the aim of the talks was to prevent an arms race in space and stop the arms race on earth, and that these two problems were closely linked to each other. Strict compliance with this agreement is bound to bring success, yet Washington has adopted a different attitude.

From the outset the American administration said it would go ahead with Star Wars whatever the circumstances. But how does it hope to prevent an arms race in space when it puts every effort into building space attack weapons? Washington claims that the program is only in the stage of research, but it would be ridiculous to think that it's going to squander multi-billion sums on just nothing. It is a very short way from the development of a weapons system to its testing and adoption. If the United States got hold of space attack weapons this would greatly upset the overall strategic situation. With such weapons the United States thinks it would be able to get away with a first nuclear strike. So, who'd expect a country facing a real nuclear threat on earth and a possible threat from space to agree to cuts in its forces of retaliation? Any sober-minded person would see that such a country would have not to reduce its offensive weapons but to build them up. Accordingly, the Soviet Union warns that if the United States goes ahead with Star Wars it will have no other option but to take counter-measures, including steps to update and strengthen its offensive nuclear potential.

With the American administration intent on building space attack weapons it is impossible to start limiting, let alone reducing, the present nuclear stocks. There can be no progress at Geneva as long as the Americans cling to their Star Wars program. If the sides are to make mutually acceptable reductions in both strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons, it is necessary to observe the earlier accord on the need to reach agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space.

As for the Soviet Union, it went to both rounds of the talks determined that the sides should agree not to build space attack weapons and to scrap whatever anti-satellite systems they have. This would solve the problem of preventing the militarization of space. What's more, the Soviet Union proposes that nuclear arms be radically reduced and eventually eliminated altogether.

Some American politicians say they're in the dark as to the scale of the proposed reductions, but the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has made it plain that his country is ready for a 25 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons and would not object to even greater mutual cuts. All of this of course would be possible only if no arms race began in space. At the moment it is clear to every unprejudiced person that the old American position offers little hope for progress at Geneva. The only way to make headway is by observing last January's accords and by renouncing preparations for Star Wars.

CSO: 5200/1261-a

U.S-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: BRANDT, CRAXI TALKS WITH SOVIET LEADERS ASSESSED

Geneva Talks Discussed

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 24, Jun 85 pp 5-7

[Article by V. Kuznetsov]

[Text]

The end of May was marked by notable events on the European and world political scene. One of these events was the talks Mikhail Gorbachev had in Moscow with Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and president of the Socialist International. Another was the exchange of views between the Soviet leadership and Prime Minister Craxi of Italy.

These political contacts and consultations evoked much interest and met with wide approbation in West Germany, Italy, and other countries of the European continent, and were widely commented also beyond its bounds. A high appraisal of the significance of the meetings with the representatives of West Germany and Italy was given by the Political Bureau of the CPSU which underscored the need and usefulness, in the present tense and dangerous international situation, of the expansion and activation of cooperation of all forces striving to preserve and strengthen peace. Such contacts make it possible, ideological and other differences notwithstanding, to find points of contact on vital problems relating to the ending of the arms race, return to détente, and promotion of productive political dialogue and fruitful co-operation between states belonging to different social systems.

The participants in the meetings and talks in Moscow did not confine themselves to a general review of the European and world situation. The exchange of views was at the same time a joint search for ways of reducing the present dangerous tension. Many constructive ideas which, if realized, would make for a turn for the better in inter-state relations were put forward.

The Moscow dialogues took place on the eve of the second round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. The participants naturally devoted keen attention to the problems on the agenda in Geneva. The crucial thing is the creation around the Geneva talks of an atmosphere conducive to the utmost to progress towards the objectives agreed upon by the two sides.

The Soviet Union is working to create precisely such an atmosphere. Elementary logic makes it clear that in order to curb and reverse the arms race it must first be halted. This is the Soviet Union's position. Willy Brandt too holds that the continued production of more armaments is not compatible with talks about arms reduction.

The Soviet Union has proposed to the United States that all activity towards the creation of space strike weapons be stopped and a freeze imposed on nuclear-missile arsenals for the duration of the talks. Further steps could be far-reaching, radical reductions of strategic and medium-range armaments. The Soviet Union does not limit itself merely to urging this; it has proclaimed a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of its own medium-range missiles and suspended other countermeasures in Europe.

How has the U.S. responded to all this? By placing orders for the manufacture of weapons for the "star wars" programme. By starting practical tests of elements of this system. By putting through Congress a programme for the production of MX first-strike intercontinental missiles. A new Trident submarine with 24 strategic missiles on board has just been launched. Further,

the U.S. is going ahead with the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. While the U.S. delegates in Geneva are lavish in giving assurances that the world has in the White House the most zealous advocate of the elimination of nuclear weapons, the U.S., as Newsweek has observed, is set on taking advantage of the opportunity to shred the entire system of arms control accords.

Even some seasoned U.S. Congressmen accustomed to satisfying the most voracious militarist appetites of the Administration are embarrassed by this duplicity and hypocrisy of the White House, and are trying to bring it to its senses by some slight cuts in appropriations for military programmes. But the quarters bent on gaining military superiority do not listen to reason. A gang of lilliputs trying to tie the hands of executive authority is how Congress has been described by the chief "disarmer," U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency director Kenneth Adelman. The President himself cannot desist from admiring the Pentagon Guliver flexing his muscles.

But what about the Geneva talks and the agreement in principle between the United States and the Soviet Union to work jointly to end the arms race on earth and prevent its spread to outer space? Here is a revealing sidelight: in the final communiqué of the May session of the NATO Defence Planning Committee only the 11th paragraph (out of a total of 13) makes any mention of the openings offered by the talks in Geneva. NATO is well aware of what the moods and priorities of the White House are. And hence arms limitation does not enter into its plans.

"In the past, we have tended to alternate between building up our strength and negotiations," Secretary of State George Shultz said, formulating the present U.S. approach to arms limitation. "But both must go together." Parallel lines, as we know, do not intersect each other. And can continue to infinity. As regards buildup of military strength, this is being done, and vigorously and with an eye to the long term. But as regards negotiations, the behaviour of the Administration makes one wonder whether the "parallelism" does not consist in trying to gain time for accumulating strategic strength, for the development of a new class of weapons—space strike weapons, a "star

wars" potential. Does this not determine the U.S. style of conducting negotiations in Geneva? This non-constructive line is evoking critical comment everywhere, the United States included. The purpose of this criticism is to induce Washington to correct that line in the interests of achieving mutually acceptable agreement that would benefit not only the two countries directly concerned, but also the rest of the international community. But there are also other voices. "The more concerted NATO support of the American style of conducting negotiations the greater are the chances of success in Geneva," West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl says. But blind support of an unsavoury position will not carry things forward.

The chances of success in Geneva lie in something else. Speaking of them, Benedetto Craxi pointed to the need to observe the Soviet-American understanding of January 8 this year, the spirit and the letter of the ABM treaty, and rough parity of forces. With the torpedoing of the preceding talks in mind, the Italian leader said: "Talks are always difficult, but a repeated failure of negotiations would create an incomparably more complex situation." This is a timely warning.

A special place was occupied in the Moscow talks by the question of what outer space should be like—weapons-free or militarized. It is no exaggeration to say that it is also a question of whether there is to be real disarmament or not, secure peace or not.

During the Soviet-Italian talks both sides agreed that the reduction of the war danger largely depends on whether concrete agreements are reached on the prevention of the arms race in outer space and its termination on earth. Willy Brandt confirmed his party's opposition in principle to the militarization of outer space in any way. This position was taken also by the Socialist parties of the European countries at their meeting in Paris at the end of May.

The White House has its own concept of politics. The only policies it accepts are the American policy of total armament and pro-American policies. It is realized on the other side of the Atlantic that they cannot go it alone. Hence the intention to mobilize the entire NATO cohort to the establishment of militarist presence in outer space.

The attitude of governments, parliaments and parties to Reagan's space design is becoming the touchstone of their real approach to peace and disarmament. "Anyone who is able to assess the situation without bias and who sincerely wants to safeguard peace cannot but be opposed to 'star wars,'" Mikhail Gorbachev has said on this score. The correctness of this conclusion is confirmed day after day both by mass protests and by the pronouncements of well-known politicians, scientists and public leaders.

After the provocative deployment of a new nuclear first-strike potential at the junction of the two worlds, Western Europe is being involved in still another gamble. Yet to support the "strategic defence initiative" is to support the undermining of strategic stability, the drift towards a nuclear holocaust.

The epochal task of the day—ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space—can be resolved only along the lines of military détente, mutual understanding and confidence, by getting rid of the "potential adversary" mentality. The communiqué on Mikhail Gorbachev's conversation with Willy Brandt points out that the Soviet Union and West Germany can be partners in the matter of security [my emphasis—V.K.] despite all that divides them owing to their affiliation with different alliances. The other NATO countries, the U.S. included, could unquestionably become such partners with the U.S.S.R.

Is it an illusion to pose the question thus at a time when the world is gripped by confrontation? Certainly not. For there is a historical precedent that fully proved its worth—the anti-Hitler coalition of states with different social systems and ideologies. This coalition, this anti-fascist cooperation on the battlefield, was the practical embodiment and conclusive test of the idea of collective security advanced by the Soviet Union and upheld by it from its very inception, of the idea of partnership in resolving the question of war and peace. What justified itself in the forties could well serve humanity also in the eighties, could prevail over mankind's common enemy—the nuclear threat.

"The supreme responsibility," Willy Brandt holds, "is responsibility for peace. I believe we have understood each other, realized that we are allies in this struggle for life, irrespective of

differences in other spheres. Or, speaking in the language of diplomats, in questions relating to security we are partners, although each of us knows his place in the framework of his alliance and we bear different responsibilities in our respective alliances." The leader of the West German Social Democratic Party does not have in mind withdrawal from NATO, "parting with the U.S." or transition to the "Soviet orbit," as is alleged by unscrupulous critics in West Germany and the United States, whose President during a visit to Bonn declined to meet Brandt.

Those on both sides of the Atlantic who are concerned over the state of relations inside NATO see the danger where it does not exist. They should lend an ear to what such an experienced politician as former Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky has to say: "In my opinion the main danger consists in the external ideological policy of Reaganism. It not only tends to divide East and West, it also contains the danger of division between America and the Europeans, who are greatly disquieted by Reagan's policy." As regards the U.S.S.R., which is also being blamed for the discord in NATO, Willy Brandt, recalling his chancellorship, confirmed that it "never tried to put our loyalty to the alliance to the test, or to use us against the United States."

The leader of the West German Social Democratic Party has been pounced upon by those who reduce the question of alliances to the primitive formula: the United States is our friend and the Soviet Union the enemy. By those who simply do not understand, or do not wish to understand, that it is vitally necessary for both East and West to overcome the present confrontation, to enter into partnership in the decisive sphere of their relations, the sphere of security, and to achieve a situation when the various countries, while remaining members of the Warsaw Treaty or of NATO, could nevertheless scale down the military confrontation, launch out on military détente.

The question raised by the chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party is one for which the answer is being sought by many not only in West Germany, but in the Western world in general. "Should the Federal Republic confine itself to the role of the United States' most important partner or ex-

pand its relations with the countries of the East?" the Neue Ruhr-Zeitung political analyst Herbert Straeten asks. The same question, but in blunter terms, has been asked by the West German Communist *Unsere Zeit*: "Is the Federal Republic looking for allies to perish with in the next world war, or allies for another 40 years of peace?"

It is the postwar settlement in the spirit of the Yalta, Potsdam, and Helsinki decisions that has ensured Europe four decades of peace. Proceeding from this, the participants in the talks in Moscow declared for the constructive continuation of the process of strengthening security and promoting cooperation in Europe.

Détente, good-neighbourship and co-operation were the symbols of the seventies—symbols projected to the future. The experience of those years—probably the most fruitful decade in East-West relations—in promoting political dialogue and joint action, large-scale economic and other cooperation, and the search for ways of going over to military détente is invaluable for carrying forward what was then begun. This experience has not been cancelled out by the critics of post-Helsinki Europe. It is still actively operating capital.

Moreover, the Soviet Union believes that Europe has not left behind the crest of détente; it is not a matter of the past, but rears up on the horizon. Though aware of all the difficulties involved, the Soviet leadership nevertheless sees openings for further advance to a stable system of international rule of law and security. It would be in place to meet in Helsinki on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Final Act of the all-European Conference with the object of reviving and deepening the process of détente.

How to ensure the coming of a new stage of détente and constructive policies in East-West relations? The Soviet Union is convinced that this necessarily requires large-scale measures to reduce military tension. The most promising and reliable way to the tangible strengthening of European security is to rid the continent completely of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, and also of chemical weapons. The U.S.S.R. is ready for such a cardinal solution of the problem. But it has to reckon with the fact that far from all are prepared to take such resolute action. In view of this, diverse

variants for stage-by-stage advance towards this goal are proposed.

What are these variants? The undertaking by the NATO countries of the commitment which the Soviet Union undertook three years ago and which remains in force—the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The conclusion of a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of relations of peace by the members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, by all participants in the all-European Conference. The conclusion of an agreement between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries on reducing military spending. The achievement at the Stockholm conference of accord on major measures of a political character and concrete confidence-building measures in the military sphere. The signing by the participants in the Vienna talks of a concrete practical agreement on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe—in the North (proposed by Finland) and in the centre of the continent (the Swedish proposal for a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons). The creation of a European zone free of chemical weapons.

Each of these measures could give impetus to transition to the military détente so vitally needed by Europe.

Another timely question is the establishment of mutually beneficial relations between the two biggest economic organizations in Europe—the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community. Some time ago the CMEA countries proposed to the members of the Common Market the establishment of contacts and submitted a draft agreement on cooperation. But for a number of reasons—not through the fault of the socialist countries—this initiative was not developed further. The long-awaited turn towards cooperation would be useful from the standpoint of improving the overall climate in Europe. Since the EEC acts also as a political entity Mikhail Gorbachev drew attention to the Soviet Union's readiness to seek a common language with it also in regard to specific international problems.

A search for accord, avenues for strengthening worldwide cooperation, and for ways and means of overcoming the instability of the international situa-

tion and removing the threat of war—this was the substance and purport of the conversations in Moscow. Only this line of action can lead Europe and the entire world community out of the blind alleys of confrontation, antagonism, and military, above all nuclear, confrontation.

In his recent message to the people of India, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union has never looked at the world in the context of Soviet-American relations alone. These words, as

can be judged by the wide comment they evoked, were seen by Europeans as testimony to their own significant role not only in the affairs of the continent, but in world affairs. The talks between the Soviet leadership and the West German and Italian party and state leaders demonstrated how highly the Soviet Union evaluates the political weight of Europe, and the importance it attaches to its foreign policy relating to Europe.

### Brandt Visit 'Useful'

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 24, Jun 85 pp 6-7

[Article by V. Ivanov]

[Text]

The past few years have seen a marked development of contacts between the CPSU and a number of Social Democratic and Socialist parties. In promoting these contacts the CPSU proceeds from the thesis of the 26th CPSU Congress to the effect that "present-day Social Democracy has considerable political weight. It could do more for the defence of the vital interests of the peoples and, above all, for the consolidation of peace, for improving the international situation, repulsing fascism and racism, and the reactionary offensive on the political rights of the working people." The CPSU actively supports all the efforts useful to the cause of peace and democracy, including those by the Socialist International aimed at ending the arms race and confrontation.

Hence the welcome accorded in the Soviet Union to Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, president of the Socialist International, who visited our country on May 26-29, 1985.

On May 27, Willy Brandt and his party were received by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The sides discussed a wide range of questions

connected with the contemporary world situation, and exchanged opinions on many issues of vital importance for the strengthening of peace and security, for the broadening of West-East cooperation.

The talk has revealed that both parties see virtually eye to eye on such cardinal problems of the current situation as the impermissibility of the militarization of outer space, and the need for tangible progress at the U.S.S.R.-U.S. Geneva talks, with the principle of discussing space and nuclear arms as interrelated issues observed. It was pointed out that both parties hold largely similar or identical views on the need to ensure reliable security in Europe, to go back to détente and to promote normal good-neighbourly relations between the countries of this continent, the Soviet Union and West Germany included.

The persons who accompanied Willy Brandt had meetings and talks with Alexei Antonov, Soviet Deputy Premier; First Deputy Minister of Defence, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergei Akhromeyev, and Yuri Israel, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Control of Natural Environment. They visited the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Merchant

Marine, the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries.

At a press conference arranged at the press centre of the U.S.S.R. Foreign Ministry Willy Brandt expressed satisfaction with the results of his visit to the Soviet Union. He also answered Soviet and foreign newsmen's questions.

Addressing a breakfast given in the Kremlin in his honour, Willy Brandt said: "I share many scientists' doubts as to the possibility of the strategic use of outer space; what's more, I deem it a mistake to embark upon this undertaking which will cause extra threats and draw the mental energies and resources we need so badly to solve the formidable problems facing us on

our earth. What we need is not more and 'better quality' deadly weapons, but a better policy."

One cannot but subscribe to these words. Willy Brandt's visit to Moscow has shown that for all our ideological differences with the Social Democrats, our stands on a number of political problems coincide.

The visit to Moscow by the leaders of the West German Social Democrats and by Willy Brandt, president of the Socialist International, has attracted much attention the world over. International comments on this visit bear out its timeliness.

The CPSU will go on making every effort to promote contacts with the political parties and organizations advocating détente and a lasting world peace.

CSO: 5200/1273

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS GROUP MEETINGS 11-20 JUNE

Space Arms Group 11 June

LD111128 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 11 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 11 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group on space weapons has been held within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons here today.

Strategic Weapons Group 12 June

LD121201 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 12 Jun (TASS)--The group on strategic armaments has met for a session here today within the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

INF Group 13 June

LD131148 Moscow TASS in English 1133 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 13 Jun (TASS)--The group of intermediate range nuclear arms met for a session here today within the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

Space Arms Group 18 June

LD181235 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 18 Jun (TASS)--The group on space arms held a session here today in the framework of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Weapons Group 19 June

LD191143 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 19 Jun (TASS)--A session of the group on strategic armaments was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

INF Group 20 June

LD201248 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 20 Jun (TASS)--A group on medium-range nuclear arms at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons held a meeting here today.

CSO: 5200/1261-a

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

UN DELEGATE WELCOMES GENEVA ARMS REDUCTION TALKS

Dhaka THE BANGLADESH TIMES in English 10 May 85 pp 1, 8

[Text] Bangladesh has expressed its happiness at the recent resumption of arms reduction talks between the two super powers in Geneva, reports BSS.

Participating in a debate in the UN Disarmament Commission in New York yesterday Lt Gen (Retd) Khwaja Wasiuddin, Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the UN General Assembly, expressed also grave concern at the unprecedented arms race, both nuclear and conventional.

He said that Bangladesh was happy to note that the two super powers had recently resumed their negotiations and hoped that any progress achieved at the negotiations should make a positive contribution towards the reduction of international tensions.

Ambassador Wasiuddin said that Bangladesh was firmly convinced that there could be no durable peace without the elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons. Bangladesh, he said, in pursuance of her firm and irrevocable commitment to the General and Complete Disarmament (GOD), had acceded to the nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction was an essential prerequisite for the creation of atmosphere of trust and confidence and the relaxation of international tensions, he observed.

He said Bangladesh was equally alarmed to note that attempts were being made by the nuclear powers to use the outer space for military purposes.

All such attempts, he said, should be halted and the outer space declared as a common heritage of mankind.

Turning to the reduction of military budgets, he said that Bangladesh had emphasized the need to divert the colossal financial and other resources currently being consumed by the armaments race towards the elimination of the poverty the world over.

Expressing concern on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, Ambassador Wasiuddin said that determined efforts must be made during the current session to adopt concrete recommendations with a view to preventing South Africa from becoming a nuclear power.

Ambassador Wasiuddin said the question of disarmament which had global dimensions and implications could only be addressed in a multilateral context.

CSO: 5250/0009

SPACE ARMS

TASS CITES U.S. CRITICS OF SDI

Robert McNamara

LD061917 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 6 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, June 6, TASS--Robert McNamara, former U.S. secretary of defence, has declared against the "Star Wars" program, for the observance of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-missile Systems and of the interim government on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, for the success of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. In the course of the press conference devoted to the forthcoming publication of an article written by him in collaboration with Hans Albrecht Bethe, a Nobel Prize winning physicist, Robert McNamara refuted the arguments of the Reagan administration that the "Star Wars" program was a defensive one. The attempts of one of the sides, he stressed, at building up its potential will inevitably lead to the build-up by the other side of both defensive and offensive weapons, and escalate the arms race to new and uncontrolled heights.

The article on lessening the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, which is to be published in the July issue of the ATLANTIC magazine, points out that the hopes of the Reagan administration to ruin military superiority over the Soviet Union are futile. Robert McNamara and Hans Albrecht Bethe recalled that although the USA was the first to produce atomic weapons, the Soviet Union, despite the enormous losses caused by the war, created its own atomic weapons within an amazingly short span of time. That was the case throughout the whole of the arms race which has always been initiated by the USA, and the Soviet Union invariably overtook the United States.

Union of Concerned Scientists

LD070725 Moscow TASS in English 0606 GMT 7 Jun 85

[Text] New York, June 7, TASS--The president of the Union of Concerned Scientists, an influential American public organization, has strongly denounced the Reagan administration's "Star Wars" program. Speaking in an NBC Television show, Henry Kendall said the program would usher in another round of the arms race on earth and spread it also to outer space. He added that it would be gross folly to believe that if the Soviet Union opposed the "Star Wars" program, then it met American interests. The continued arms race met

the interests of neither country. In fact, it contradicted the interests of all countries and peoples.

Kendall vigorously rejected claims that the implementation of the so-called strategic Defense initiative would increase U.S. security. Each time a new weapons system appeared in the United States, he said, the military and some experts contended that national security would now be stronger. All that, however, had led to a situation where the people had come to face a horrible threat of nuclear destruction, which was growing all the time. With the anti-ballistic missile space defense idea now in the works, history was bound to repeat itself as the Soviet Union would be compelled to adopt countermeasures in the field. That was why, the American scientist said, "Star Wars" was a provocative venture, a frightfully costly and very dangerous program for sustaining the arms buildup, which was seen by the Soviet Union as a U.S. bid to gain military superiority over itself.

Science was no magic, and the space-based ABM system would not work out as its proponents claimed. To reduce the threat of a nuclear war, Kendall emphasized, it was essential to use the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms now under way in Geneva, where it was possible to come to terms on keeping the arms race from outer space.

CSO: 5200/1256

SPACE ARMS

TASS CONTRASTS U.S., SOVIET SPACE ACTIVITIES

LD152031 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS--TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov writes:

On the same day the teleprinters of two news agencies, one Soviet and the other American, carried reports on space experiments, one of which is aimed at promoting science for peace and the other at developing technology for war and destruction.

On June 15 the Soviet interplanetary probe Vega-2 delivered to the atmosphere of Venus a descent module and an autonomous aerostatic probe. Scientific data sent back to Earth will help to unravel the mysteries of Venus. The experiment is an example of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space: the descent modules of Vega-2 and its sister probe, Vega-1, which had reached Venus a few days earlier, carried new-generation instruments, some of which had been developed jointly with French specialists.

On June 15 the countdown began for the launch of the U.S. manned spaceship Discovery planned for Monday. The crew led by the American Daniel Brandenstein includes, along with his compatriots, Frenchman Patrick Baudry, the stand-by of the first French cosmonaut, Jean-Louis Cretien, who made a space flight aboard a Soviet spaceship, and Prince Sultan Sulaylman al-Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia. Along with peaceful research, the Discovery will carry out a series of experiments under Reagan's "star wars" programme.

The Soviet Union has always stood for preventing the militarization of space. The memorandums of March 18 and April 30, 1957, and of March 1958, were aimed to achieve that goal. As a result of the joint efforts of the USSR and other countries, a treaty was signed in October 1967 to regulate the activities of states in studying and exploring outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. It recorded the obligation of the parties to it not to put into orbits around the Earth any objects with nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction aboard. It was stipulated that the moon and other celestial bodies should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The conclusion of the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater in August 1963 and of the convention banning the

military or any other hostile use of the means of the modification of the environment in 1972 were major landmarks in restricting the use of space for military purposes. Lastly, the Soviet-American Treaty on Limiting Antimissile Defense Systems, concluded in perpetuity, became a major obstacle to the use of space for military purposes. It expressly prohibits the development, testing and deployment of systems or components of space-based antimissile defences.

Following the letter and the spirit of the 1972 Treaty, the Soviet Union does not develop attack space weapons or antimissile defences (the treaty allows each side to have only a limited air defence system for one region, either the capital or a base of intercontinental ballistic missiles). The USSR is carrying out research, including military research, but it is not aimed at developing attack space weapons but is related to the improvement of early warning, surveillance, communications and navigational space systems.

Unlike the Soviet Union, the United States, following President Reagan's initiative, is about to open a new area of the arms race by initiating the militarization of space. The programme of the shuttle multi-purpose spaceships is used for the purpose.

It is planned with their help, for instance, to launch military satellites, the Pentagon's orbital command posts and space weapons of a new type. Work on controlled energy weapons (laser and rail guns) [as received] is being extensively carried on. The main purpose of those weapons is to destroy space, aerial, land and sea targets and components of these weapons are planned to be tested and used in conjunction with flights of shuttle spaceships.

In this situation the Soviet Union has stated that it will not allow the strategic balance to be upset. We do not want "star wars," and we stand for the peaceful exploration of space, which was symbolized at one time by the joint Soviet-U.S. Soyuz-Apollo space venture. Regrettably, the choice between lasting peace and war depends not only on the Soviet Union.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

U.S. SPACE PLANS MAY CAUSE 'RUNAWAY ARMS RACE'

LD120505 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 11 Jun 85

Text American officials insist that the star wars program is but a research effort in keeping with the treaty on limiting antiballistic missile systems. But the United States, writes our commentator, Gennadiy Shishkin, is to spend \$26 billion on the star wars program up to the end of the 1980's. Officially the money will be spent on research, and it is research that is the crucial phase of weapon development. One case in point was the Manhattan Project which led to the development of the atom bomb and resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands of Japanese in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Its long-term effect is the present threat of annihilation facing all of humanity. The star wars project cannot be different. Research and development are known to consume the lion's share of expenditures on any weapons program; about 90 percent. The remaining 10 percent is spent on starting production. That being so, the star wars research which has already involved actual tests, marks the beginning of a space weapons generation. The project flouts the Soviet-American antiballistic missile treaty which was signed in 1972 for an indefinite period. The treaty bans any research but that in improving the limited ABM systems permitted under the treaty. It does ban the deployment of an ABM defense on national territory and the development and testing of space-based ABM systems or components, and this is exactly the aim of the present research effort in the United States. Clearly, this work violates the letter and spirit of the 1972 treaty.

In an attempt to justify the development of attack space weapons administration officials allege that the Soviet Union is conducting military research in space. But this is an absolutely different kind of research, aimed at improving systems intended for early warning and surveillance and communications and navigation. It does not overreach the limits of the ABM treaty. The Soviet Union is not developing attack space weapons, it is not deploying an ABM defense on its national territory. It is not doing anything of the sort that the United States is doing under its star wars program. The Soviet Union firmly adheres to the provisions of the ABM treaty. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has called on the United States to set a moratorium at once on space and nuclear weapons for the duration of the Geneva talks. It calls on it to follow the Soviet move made in August 1983 and pledge not to deploy antisatellite weapons in space and given an agreement to ban the militarization of space, destroy all antisatellite systems existing in the Soviet Union and the United States. Unfortunately Washington has turned a deaf ear to these proposals. As it continues, under the guise of a research effort, to develop attack space weapons, the American administration threatens to undo everything that has been achieved so far in limiting both offensive and defensive nuclear arms. As a result, the world may be confronted with a runaway arms race in all avenues.

18 July 1985

## SPACE ARMS

## TASS HITS KAMPELMAN REMARKS AT FLORENCE SEMINAR

LD161831 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] Rome June 16 TASS--TASS correspondent Viktor Solomin reports:

The United States has made another attempt at drawing its "star wars" plans. Speaking at the just-concluded seminar in Florence on matters of international politics, Max Kampelman, the leader of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on reducing nuclear and space arms, directly stated that Reagan's so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) must be a reinforcing factor of the Atlantic alliance. He set out "considerations" which ostensibly made the U.S. Administration increase strategic defence research, having levelled absurd accusations at the Soviet Union.

Max Kampelman, clearly expressing concern over the mounting opposition in Western Europe to the U.S. space weaponisation programme, resorted to a heavy-handed attempt at reassuring the West European public opinion by stating that the United States is ostensibly prepared to discuss all these matters with its allies, and even to take into account all their considerations, advice and worries. He went on to say that everything that the USA is doing now is only "a program of research". Besides, Kampelman said reassuringly that the results of the research will not necessarily be used for the production of arms.

However, despite all the endeavours the U.S. representative's assurances failed to convince those present of the good intentions of the United States. Jacques Andreani, the ambassador of France to Italy, in a speech at the seminar strongly criticized the SDI. France, he said has a good deal of serious doubt about the U.S. initiative.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW HITS U.S. VOTE ON UN SPACE ARMS RESOLUTION

LD172211 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Commentary by Igor Charikov]

[Text] The annual session of the UN Committee on Peaceful Use of Space is starting its work in New York today. As UN circles note, the session will concentrate on the issue of preventing space militarization. Here is the "Latest News" commentary with Igor Cnarikov at the microphone:

The view on the necessity of urgent measures in order to prevent transferring the arms race into space is now shared by the majority of the world community. It is enough to mention the fact that delegations from 150 countries at the 39th UN General Assembly sessions supported the resolution which is called precisely, "The Prevention of the Arms Race in Space." The resolution was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union and only one country, the U.S., did not support the resolution. Once again the U.S. was confronting practically the entire world, including its traditional allies. As you can see, they are at opposites in principle positions.

At a time when the Soviet Union is advocating consistently and persistently wide international cooperation in assimilating and exploring space for peaceful purposes, the U.S. is adjusting its shuttle program for the needs of the Pentagon. In violation of the permanent Soviet-U.S. 1972 ABM Treaty, the current administration has proclaimed and begun carrying out the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. Highly-placed administration figures are trying to present it as a defensive program and the preparations toward its realization, which have already begun, as scientific research. Under this pretext the White House is categorically rejecting the Soviet Union's proposal to agree on a moratorium during the entire period of the Geneva talks on the creation, including scientific research, and deployment of space weapons.

It is absolutely obvious that Washington is trying very hard to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union through stationing in space offensive missiles and nuclear weapons. Even some of the U.S. NATO allies are beginning to understand the consequences of this adventure. As for world public opinion, it is clear and definite -- space should remain peaceful.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN CRITICIZES U.S. RATIONALE FOR SDI

PM171015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Kokoshin: "In Pursuit of Illusions: The 'Star Wars' Supporters' Shaky Arguments"]

[Text] The plans of the U.S. Administration to implement its so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," or, more accurately, its program for the creation of space-based strike weapons, are meeting with increasing opposition among public and political circles in the most diverse countries. Criticism of that program is even being mounted within the United States itself, and by prestigious scientists among others. The opposition to the plans for the militarization of space is forcing Washington to look for additional justificatory arguments, to sidestep, and to maneuver. In so doing the administration has to bear in mind, in particular, that scientists from different countries have been convincingly demonstrating the scientific and technical impossibility of creating an impenetrable antimissile shield.

A number of studies, including those conducted in the United States, have confirmed the conclusion drawn by Soviet academicians in the "Address to All the Scientists of the World": namely, that "defensive" weapons of this kind deployed either partially or fully in space are virtually incapable of helping a country subjected to a mass attack since they cannot defend the bulk of the population. The use of an "antimissile shield" is appropriate to the attacking country striving to diminish the force of a counter-strike (it should be noted that this cannot fully prevent a counterstrike, either).

Despite those conclusions the advocates of "star wars" are trying to speed up the development of space weapons. Even an ABM system of limited potential, function, and scale equipped with space-based elements will exert, it is claimed, a "stabilizing effect" on the world strategic situation. Even so, the United States is not abandoning the problem of trying to create the most extensive ABM system possible in the longer term. The initial system is viewed there as an interim stage on the path toward producing an all-embracing system.

The creation of an ABM system of limited effectiveness is justified specifically by the need to defend the United States against "third countries," that is, states which may acquire nuclear weapons in the near future and which, as a number of Western socialists believe, may try to blackmail even the great powers by means of nuclear weapons. The argument, of course, does not hold water. So the thesis is also put forward that a limited ABM system, incapable of repulsing a significant nuclear strike, will still be able to protect a country against the accidental or unauthorized firing of nuclear weapons.

The supporters of this system also claim that it will strengthen the nuclear war deterrence factor by increasing the degree of uncertainty in an enemy's strategic planning and making it "inordinately difficult for a potential aggressor to plan a feasible first strike." Furthermore, they believe it desirable and technically feasible in the foreseeable future to deploy a large number of ABM complexes (including in space) solely to protect their ICBM launch installations which, in their opinion, are becoming increasingly vulnerable as a result of the greater accuracy and destructiveness of ICBM warheads.

It should immediately be noted here that if any of the aforementioned options are implemented, it would undermine the open-ended Soviet-U.S. ABM Limitation Treaty (1972) which plays an important stabilizing role in the present-day complex and tense international situation. The maintenance and strict observance of that treaty guarantee successful progress toward reaching accords in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments. It is no coincidence that it has been fiercely attacked by militarist forces in the United States.

The arguments put forward by the devisers of the different forms of "star wars" do not stand up to serious criticism. If one is guided by normal logic and not by the distorted and narrow self-interested thinking of the ringleaders of the U.S. military-industrial complex, it is obvious that a far more effective way of protecting states against nuclear blackmail, and in particular against the use of nuclear weapons, would be for all states possessing nuclear weapons to adopt a commitment on the non-first use of such weapons, as the Soviet Union has done, and to establish in relations among them certain norms which exclude nuclear blackmail and a strong-arm policy combined with nuclear deterrence. It goes without saying in this respect the United States and the other nuclear powers, following the USSR's example, should actually demonstrate to other states their desire to limit and reduce their own nuclear arms, as they are indeed committed by a section of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

The argument about the need to create a large system in space to provide protection against the accidental or unauthorized firing of combat missiles may, at first glance, seem attractive to some people in the West. However, those who advocate it deliberately overlook the fact that the risk of such firing may be reduced by far less technically complex and less dangerous measures. The risk of the accidental or unauthorized firing of missiles must be judged not only against the military-political and economic cost of creating a large scale ABM system but also against the danger of activating such strike weapons oneself as a result of an error in the detection and target recognition system or in the control element. Scientists' calculations indicate that the likelihood of error or failure in the operation of a given control element in an ABM system of the kind conceived of by the Pentagon's strategists will be considerably greater than the likelihood of accidental firing.

The Washington administration's claim that an ABM system with space-based elements, even if limited in scale and function, will be of stabilizing significance by "increasing the degree of uncertainty for the other side in the strategic planning of a nuclear strike" is also built on sand.

First, the authors of that thesis ignore the USSR's unilateral commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons, which, incidentally, provides even stricter guidelines for

the organization of rigid controls ensuring that the unauthorized firing of nuclear weapons does not take place. If the United States and its allies possessing nuclear weapons were to adopt such a commitment, the situation would become considerably more stable and safer from the viewpoint of reducing the likelihood of a premeditated first strike and of the accidental or unauthorized firing of missiles.

Second, there is already a considerable degree of uncertainty inherent in the present-day strategic situation by virtue of the existence of nuclear weapons, which have not yet been used for conducting combat operations on a wide scale. Why increase that uncertainty, you might ask. Once introduced into one side's strategic and operational planning, it will inevitably affect the degree of uncertainty for the other, which would lead to a destabilization of the strategic situation, the undermining of the existing strategic equilibrium, and an increase in the threat of the occurrence of nuclear war.

One really effective measure for averting the threat of a "first strike" would be to impose a quantitative and qualitative freeze on nuclear arms. In particular, it would prevent an increase in the sides' arsenals of highly accurate nuclear systems that are capable of threatening such a strike (for example, America's new MX ICBM, the Trident-2 SLBM, Pershing II medium-range ballistic missiles, and long-range ground-launched cruise missiles).

It is also necessary to take steps to restrict naval activity, particularly with regard to aircraft carriers, which increases strategic instability, and a number of other measures to reduce the likelihood and feasibility of a disabling first strike. It is well known that the relevant proposals have already been put forward by the Soviet Union.

Finally, if the United States, despite the 1972 Treaty, begins creating a form of ABM system with space-based elements allegedly designed simply to ensure the survival of its ICBM launch installations, the other side may, with complete justification, view that as a step aimed at building an extensive ABM system. A multi-element [mnogokompleksnaya] U.S. ABM system designed to protect ICBM installations outside the limits stipulated by the 1972 ABM Treaty and the 1974 protocol to it would in themselves represent a destabilizing system as one of the most important means for providing logistic support for the concept of "protracted" and "limited" nuclear wars.

U.S. strategists envisage an exchange of strikes against ICBM launch silos without harm to industrial installations or administrative centers and without major losses of its population. They also envisage a scenario in which a first strike is delivered against such silos with impunity: After all, they say, the "ABM shield" will do its work and limit the counterstrike. Soviet military doctrine rejects the idea of "limited" nuclear war and of waging it "according to rules," as illusory and exceptionally dangerous.

However, the USSR and its allies must also take account of such concepts in U.S. military-political thinking no matter how unrealistic and adventurist they are. All attempts by the United States to upset the present military equilibrium and to secure unilateral advantages for itself will be resolutely opposed. The Soviet Union, of course, has the ability to take those measures which best meet the interests of ensuring its defense capability in the light of the general tasks of the country's socioeconomic development. At the same time, while trying to prevent a new round in the arms race and its extension into space, the Soviet Union is putting forward constructive initiatives and working determinedly in Geneva to achieve specific mutually acceptable agreements.

SPACE ARMS

USSR: FURTHER ON JUNE NATO MEETING IN PORTUGAL

SDI, SALT II DISCUSSED

LD070108 Moscow International Service in Italian 1900 GMT 6 Jun 85

[Commentary by Viktor Shlenov]

[Text] The NATO foreign ministers have met in Lisbon. Here is a note in this connection by our observer Viktor Shlenov.

U.S. Secretary of State Shultz held bilateral talks with West European ministers on the eve of this conference. As reported by the press, the leader of the U.S. diplomatic service did his utmost to obtain the allies' support for the American plans aimed at giving further impetus to the arms race. Now there is talk in Washington of the possible U.S. renunciation of the 1979 treaty on the limitation of strategic arms, SALT II.

Even though the United States did not ratify this document, it nevertheless committed itself to observe it. The USSR has strictly observed all of the treaty's articles; on the other hand, the Americans repeatedly fall short of the letter and spirit of SALT II. The document contains the two sides' commitment not to undertake actions that might thwart it. By starting the deployment of ballistic missiles, Pershing-II's and long-range cruise missiles in Western Europe, the United States has violated the aforementioned commitment. The installation of missiles constitutes a substantial increase in the U.S. strategic potential. The United States is to commission a new nuclear submarine "Ohio," in the autumn and the number of U.S. Navy strategic missiles will exceed the previously established limit.

Another U.S. nuclear strategic weapon which will exceed the limit set by SALT II is about to be put into service. However, it is crystal clear that the renunciation of SALT II will give rise to a wild arms race which will be difficult to stop later on.

The U.S. plans have aroused a negative reaction from Western Europe. The leaders of the major U.S. ally, the United Kingdom, have reacted cautiously. British Foreign Minister Howe expressed concern that the renunciation of SALT II could thwart the possibilities of success of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. Even the NATO secretary general

admitted that West European countries are very concerned at the prospect of the United States breaking-up the treaty on the limitation of strategic arms. Such a reaction is not surprising.

Concern at the absurd and irresponsible change in direction in the U.S.'s foreign policy is increasing in Western Europe. This concern is felt all the more as the current American administration attempts to implicate the allies, within the NATO framework, in its adventurist initiatives. According to newspapers, George Shultz will take advantage of the Lisbon meeting to again demand that his partners take part in Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

It is known that no NATO country has thus far given the United States its official consent, while four countries have rejected the injunction categorically, stating they do not want to participate in the creation of offensive space weapons. The U.S.'s West European partners have come to realize, even more so each day, where adherence to the preparations for the U.S. space adventures might lead them.

#### Shultz Pressure on Allies

LD092013 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program; presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] The militarization of space was the goal of a meeting of Atlanticists who gathered for their latest session of the NATO Council in Portugal. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz made use of the session primarily to step up pressure on all the Western European countries which oppose the plans for militarization of space. France, Greece, Norway and Denmark have refused to participate in these plans; Britain and the FRG, however, like Japan and Canada, agree to cooperate in developing and producing a space weapon. [Video shows exterior of building, guarded and brief clips of Lord Carrington and Shultz addressing session]

It is too early at present to judge finally which country will react, and how, to Reagan's program. For the time being one must pay attention to something else; to the responsibility which scientists, businessmen and the leaders of the Western European and other countries are adopting in coming into contact, or more precisely, entering into a conspiracy with, the American administration, which is striving to create strike space forces, a new class of weapon. Every representative of business circles, before he puts his signature to a contract; every scientist, before he goes into a space weapons laboratory; every leader, before he sanctions these actions, should stop to think. Mankind has the right to call for accountability for these acts, and will do so with all the strictness, and in the most principled manner.

The modernization of the armed forces of the countries forming, so to speak, NATO's southern flank, was also discussed at the NATO Council session in Portugal: Greece is among these countries. Here, however, an increasingly stable barrier is being put up against American military presence. This became particularly clear after the parliamentary elections held in Greece.

Resistance to U.S.

LD102320 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Jun 85

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Foreign media are commenting on the result of the NATO Council session at the foreign ministers level which has taken place in the Portuguese capital's suburb Estoril. Here to comment is our political observer Boris Kalyagin.

Hello, comrades. The ministers of NATO states were discussing key issues: Their attitude towards Reagan's Star Wars program and the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic weapons, SALT II. This treaty, as is known, was not ratified by the U.S. Senate after all, but Washington nevertheless was maintaining that it will abide by its provisions. However, the U.S. is now on the brink of an open violation of the treaty. There is an influential group of figures in the U.S. administration, including Pentagon Chief Weinberger, who would like to be done with the treaty completely and to lay the guilt at somebody else's door, as one says.

Washington's hawks initiated a forgery about the Soviet Union allegedly not fulfilling the SALT II obligations. Our country has unmasked these inventions documentarily. The invented character of them is understood by the U.S. NATO allies too. They are concerned, as THE WASHINGTON POST admits, over the fact that the U.S. decision to stop fulfilling the treaty in the future will cause a stormy negative public reaction.

At the Portuguese meeting the West European foreign ministers pointed out to U.S. Secretary of State Shultz that they are against any attempt of the Reagan administration to reject the SALT II treaty. Howe, foreign secretary of Great Britain and his West German colleague Genscher stated to Shultz that the violation of the treaty could undermine the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks and throw back the entire process of limiting weapons.

The U.S. program of militarizing space was met with serious objections too. Practically all the West European countries to a greater or lesser extent express alarm over transferring the arms race into space. The head of the U.S. State Department applied a lot of energy at the meeting in order to reduce positions of the NATO partners to a common political denominator, required by Washington, and to achieve unanimous support of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. This time, however, pressure and promises did not achieve their effect. The Star Wars program is not even mentioned in the final communique of the session. True, this document pays tribute to the usual anti-Soviet rhetoric. The NATO countries' readiness to continue further deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles on the territory of Western Europe and their approval of the program of building up conventional weapons became a clear concession to the White House. The decisions of the NATO session in Estoril have reflected growing contradictions within the North Atlantic alliance. The force of militaristic inertia of this military-political

bloc is still intact. At the same time, it is more and more difficult for the United States to force its openly aggressive course upon its partners. In Western Europe they realize better than they do across the ocean the danger of an uncontrollable arms race. Common sense, and even more political experience suggest that it is time to adopt decisions which would halt the world's slide towards the fatal brink of nuclear disaster.

CSO: 5200/1271

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW BROADCAST TO BRITAIN ON UK'S SDI ROLE

ID122232 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Commentary by political observer Anatoliy Gan within the "Glance at the British Scene" program]

[Text] Coming up next is glace at the British scene. Our political observer Anatoliy Gan assesses America's insistence in the face of its allies' uncertainty over the star wars project. This is what he writes:

The American stationed at the Greenham common missile base have been mounting exercises on British roads, jeopardizing public safety. Powerful rallies and demonstrations outside the base demanded the removal of the American missiles and the Americans from the base. But, today, we'll be talking about other Americans who are quite inconspicuous. These quiet Americans have been making frequent visits to Britain. Among them are the personal adviser to President Reagan and the father of the hydrogen bomb, Mr Teller, General Abrahamson who is in charge of work on the so-called strategic defense initiative, and Vice President Bush who was sent by President Reagan on a European tour. The vice president is facing a very difficult task. He must demonstrate to the highly skeptical European audience that the strategic defense initiative is what the West needs and make sure that the West Europeans join the United States space weapons program.

At the recent ministerial session of NATO in Portugal, Secretary of State Shultz failed to secure even a formal approval of the star wars plan from his counterparts. The final communique of the meeting does not mention any support for the strategic defense initiative because the discussion of the issue gave rise to a great deal of controversy between America and its allies. Mr Teller and Gen Abrahamson came to Britain on errands of a different kind. Their job is to buy up British scientists and put them at the service of the administration's plans to develop attack space weapons. Mr Teller said the United States is prepared to allocate one billion pounds to pay foreign scientists for their contribution to research under the program. Gen Abrahamson employs a different tactic. He has openly interfered in the work of laboratories and universities in Britain engaged in work on new generation computer hardware and software.

According to the SUNDAY TIMES, Pentagon officials have been demanding that the British Government give them exceptional powers in planning research and monitoring research programs. That interference has assumed such a scale that some members of parliament expressed the view that Washington's efforts to assume total control over Britain's research in computers run counter to Britain's national interests, the more so since Gen Abrahamson has made it clear that the United States Government will have a right to dispose of research results as it sees fit without paying anything for that right.

The quiet Americans visiting London are out to place the world in grave danger from attack space weapons. They talk of a mere research program but they have already set dates for testing components of the future attack space weapons for June and July. The first test will be carried out by the United States space shuttle "discovery" and in July another test will be carried out involving an F-16 fighter. The supporters of the so-called strategic defense initiative are paving the way to space militarization and pushing the world into a precipice.

CSO: 5200/1254

SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA INTERVIEWS GENE LAROCQUE ON SDI

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 85 p 6

[Article by A. Tolkunov: "The Concerns of Gene Larocque"]

[Text] Washington, April 1985--On 17 April 1985, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium received the address of G.R. Larocque and U.G. Carroll, managers of the American organization "Center for Defense Information." It includes an appeal to declare a moratorium on all testing of nuclear weapons beginning 6 August 1985--the 40th anniversary of the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima. The Soviet Union agreed on the date for the start of the moratorium and called for the immediate resumption of negotiations on the complete prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons. Below we publish a report from the Center for Defense Information.

Someone else perhaps, but it is difficult to suspect this gray-haired person with his open and engaging gaze of intending to undermine the national security of the United States or of not being patriotic. In December 1941 at Pearl Harbor, he did not leave his battle position under a hail of bombs. And he later took part in 13 important naval battles in the Pacific theater of military operations. After that, he was head of military colleges and occupied a respectable position at the Pentagon. All together, my interlocutor, retired Rear Admiral Gene Larocque, has 32 years of active service in the naval forces.

Larocque is now head of the Center for Defense Information, which is involved in the study and critical analysis of Pentagon programs, especially nuclear programs. And what is remarkable is that former military grades are working on this, people who served many years at the Pentagon. Who could know the subject of the research better than they! Thus, Larocque's deputy, Maj Gen K. Johnson, retired, fought in Korea and in Vietnam. In presenting the tall black-haired Cpt G. Bush, who in the past commanded a nuclear submarine, the center manager says:

"As you see, what we have here is almost a Pentagon or, more accurately, an anti-Pentagon branch. We expose the militaristic preparations of the Republican administration, its striving to attain military superiority, and various falsifications in regard to a nuclear 'lagging behind' the Russians. In this connection, we in no way are in favor of a weakening of our military power or

of some kind of unilateral disarmament. We are coming out against the predominance of the military-industrial complex--about which D. Eisenhower warned--and the negative influence of this complex on our political, economic and public life, and against the corruption among Pentagon contractors, who annually rob the taxpayers of tens of billions of dollars."

The indignation of the rear admiral is evoked by the politicians and strategists who make claims to the effect that one can not only survive but even win a nuclear war and that one can hide from it behind the notorious antinuclear cosmic umbrella.

"As a military person, I believe in planning various operations. To plan to survive a nuclear war, however, is the same as expecting a sweet life in hell."

In Washington, they are now noisily propagandizing the "Strategic Defense Initiative" [SDI] of the president of the United States as a superhuman undertaking that is called upon to save not only Americans but all of humanity from the nuclear threat.

But somehow the gray-haired rear admiral, who has seen so much in his life, does not believe in it:

"This is a pure bluff that was needed to achieve the potential of delivering the first disarming nuclear strike," he considers. "In the first place, scientists have proven that it is impossible to create an absolute defense against a nuclear strike. With the accumulated nuclear stockpiles of both sides, even the use of a small part of them will lead to 'nuclear winter'. In the second place, the creation of such a 'defense' will lead immediately to the search for ways to break through it, including a sharp increase in offensive weapons and the development of new types of these weapons. And this next spiral in the arms race is not subject to any control. Thirdly, the 'anti-ballistic umbrella' of the White House will contradict existing agreements, especially the antiballistic agreement, and it will undermine the mutual trust of the sides as well as the chances of working out constructive agreements at the Geneva talks. That is why representatives of various countries have come out unanimously at the United Nations against the arms race in space and have supported Soviet initiatives in this area."

Here it should be said that people in various countries, including the United States, intuitively sense the dangerous nature of the SDI. That is why its authors sought to suggest to the public that it involves some harmless scientific research and investigations that, in the final analysis, promise technological advantages for the country. They also maintain that the creation of space weapons can lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. The work of the information center headed by Rear Admiral Larocque is dedicated to exposing such false arguments and justifications.

This work is acquiring particularly great importance now, when the Soviet Union is making an active effort toward improving Soviet-American relations, toward reducing arms, and toward disarmament, clear evidence of which is the moratorium announced by the Soviet side on the deployment of its own medium-range missiles and its stopping the implementation of other countermeasures in

Europe related to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in a number of West European countries.

The work being carried out by the Washington center headed by Larocque is financed by the Peace Fund, an American public organization. These resources come from the modest donations of Americans alarmed by the growing nuclear threat. Larocque and his colleagues and adherents are opposed not only by the official propaganda machine but also by many former Pentagon colleagues of Larocque living from the generosity of the weapons concerns. The military contractors spare no money on their "research" activity. The task of such "research" is to deceive the people, promising them a sweet life in a nuclear hell.

"During World War II, we fought against a common enemy, against the fascist threat hanging over the world. At that time, I met Soviet sailors. They were true and reliable allies. But immediately after the end of the war, they began to teach us to hate them. If we, having achieved mutual understanding, want to eliminate the nuclear threat together, then it is essential for us to thaw out this 'cold-war' ice," says Larocque with conviction.

9746

CSO: 1807/288

SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA VIEWS WEST EUROPEAN UNION'S FAILURE TO ENDORSE SDI

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 85 p 5

[Commentary by Yuriy Kharlanov: "Cosmic 'Trap'"]

[Text] Meetings were held during the course of 2 days in Bonn by the council of the West European Union, which includes France, England, the FRG, Italy and the Benelux countries. The meeting attracted the attention of the world press primarily because the foreign and defense ministers who participated in it were seeking to work out a common position in regard to Washington's "Star Wars" program and the possible participation in it of countries allied with the United States in military blocs. The attempt was not successful and, as was reported, the ministers will return to this question at the October meeting of the WEU council.

However, the problem of a coordinated response to the proposal of the American administration to join in the research work in the scope of the plan for the militarization of space has considerable significance for U.S. allies. It is known that Washington is insisting that each country examine this question individually and implement such cooperation on a bilateral basis. Prior to the meetings of the WEU council, the State Department even sent a special message to the countries of the "seven," in which it was "not recommended" that the "Star Wars" problem be reviewed in Bonn.

The reasons for this are clear. The United States prefers to cultivate its allies on an "individual basis," for it is far from certain that the unanimous response of the countries to whom the invitation was sent will be positive. Australia and Norway, for example, have already rejected it. It is apparent that on the Potomac they therefore believe that capturing and tying their allies to an adventuristic undertaking will be easier individually than jointly.

Meanwhile, so as not to waste time, the American authorities, acting through the head of the government, have already started to organize contacts with leading military-industrial firms of Western Europe and Japan. According to press reports, more than 70 companies have now received specific proposals from the United States in this connection.

The prospects of being drawn into Washington's military space program are by no means enticing for all of its partners. France, for example, has presented

the EUREKA program to the WEU meeting, a program that foresees joint research efforts by West European countries in the area of the latest technology, including space research. And although Paris hinted that to some degree there may be a correlation between EUREKA and the American plan, the very fact of the presentation of such a program indicates the doubts of the U.S. allies that are evoked by the transatlantic space "trap" that is facing them.

In regard to the broad public of the West, its demand is that in no case should it be drawn into this "trap" or take part in the American plans for the militarization of space either individually or collectively.

9746  
CSO: 1807/288

SPACE ARMS

MORE SOVIET REPORTS OF FOREIGN OPPOSITION TO SDI

European Opposition

LD080953 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 8 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS--"Seeking to pull its West European allies and Japan into the quagmire of the 'Star Wars' program at any cost, the U.S. administration resorts not only to promises of 'access' to advanced space technology but also to outright cheating," political news analyst Sergey Losev said in the newspaper SELSKAYA ZHIZN today. "It was indulging in the latter," he added, "that American Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger was caught out recently. Speaking in an interview with the West German newspaper BILD, the Pentagon chief claimed that Washington's European partners are 'on the whole unanimous' that the 'star wars' program 'is important to the security of the NATO alliance.'"

Selfsame Weinberger, the commentator recalled, "issued a kind of ultimatum to the allies way back last March, demanding that they define their stands within the next two months and join the effort to militarize outer space. Now he is apparently at pains to make it appear that the ultimatum has done the expected job, but the contention does not have any grounds. The Governments of France, Greece, Denmark and Norway have already openly declined to take part in the American venture, while Washington's other allies are making all manner of reservations and not at all eager to plunge headlong into the White House 'Star Wars' gamble."

"The American defense secretary's lie was so transparent," Sergey Losev said further, "that Assistant Secretary of State Richard Burt then wised Congress up that no West European government had responded to the U.S. invitation to notify Washington about an intention to share in work under the program."

"The exception was West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl who publicly voiced backing for the 'star wars' project right after Ronald Reagan's visit to the cemetery of Hitlerite war criminals in Bitburg. Characteristically, the chancellor's posture was met with undisguised discontent not only in other West European countries but also in the Federal Republic of Germany itself."

Public opinion polls show that most West Germans are opposed to "Star Wars."

After noting that certain quarters in West Germany link also their own revisionist plans to the space militarization program, the news analyst said: "The recent renewal of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance has served an unambiguous warning to those who have not yet given up the illusory hope of giving a strength test to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements."

As far as expert opinion is concerned, "the vast majority of scientists are opposed to the militarization of space," Sergey Losev said further. "Suffice it to recall the Goettingen scientists' appeal to keep all kinds of weapons from outer space which has been signed by 10,834 scientists from 31 countries. A group of West German scientists against the militarization of outer space emphasized in an address that the so-called strategic defense initiative is the deception of mankind. Absolute protection against nuclear weapons is technically unfeasible, they said. Defense against nuclear weapons is impossible."

"Effective protection can be provided only by disarmament in the nuclear field," the news analyst said. "It is taking this path that the Soviet Government proposes to the world."

UK Labor Party Executive

LD131642 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] London June 13 TASS--The National Executive of the Labour Party, Britain's leading opposition party, has issued a statement denouncing a space militarization programme, advanced by the Washington administration. The Labour Party, says the statement, regards the "Strategic Defence Initiative" [SDI] as an extremely dangerous step threatening to upset the strategic balance of forces between East and West and step up the arms race.

Gandhi Cited

LD140821 Moscow TASS in English 0803 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 14 TASS--The Reagan administration's plans to force a comprehensive missile defense with space-based components "brings things closer to the brink" of a nuclear war, Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, who is staying here on an official visit, said Thursday [13 June] at a meeting with a group of American scientists opposed to the militarization of outer space.

He rejected the U.S. administration's claims that the "Star Wars" program is purely "defensive" as false, saying that its plans were not conducive to bringing the world closer to disarmament.

Well-known American astronomer Carl Sagan turned over to Rajiv Gandhi a petition from 84 prominent U.S. scientists, expressing support for the call to stop the testing, deployment and production of nuclear weapons, made in the New Delhi appeal of the heads of state and government of six countries, including Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden.

After noting that the declaration had been discussed at his recent meeting in Moscow with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Rajiv Gandhi said the Soviet leader had spoken very positively about it.

Canadian Scientists Refuse Research

LD190715 Moscow TASS in English 0621 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Ottawa June 19 TASS--More than 700 Canadian scientists and technical specialists in twenty universities of the country have declared against Reagan's programme of preparation for "Star Wars" and against Canada's participation in it.

They have put their signatures to a statement which says, in particular, that the "Star Wars" programme signifies a serious escalation of the arms race and destabilises the brittle as it is balance of nuclear forces in the world. Those who signed the statement urged the Canadian Government to turn down Washington's invitation to participate in the programme which is aimed at creating attack space systems. They also warned that they would refuse to conduct any research whatsoever if Ottawa decides to participate in the space militarisation programme.

The statement has been sent to the country's prime minister.

CSO: 5200/1269

SPACE ARMS

USSR EXPERT: IMPENETRABLE SHIELD NOT POSSIBLE

LD180833 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS -- Stanislav Rodionov, expert of the Soviet Scientists' Committee for Peace and Against Nuclear Threat, speaking in a TASS interview, said it was scientifically and technically impossible to create an impenetrable "anti-missile shield". Stanislav Rodionov heads the division of the Space Research Institute, dealing with scientific and technical aspects of the problem of disarmament and arms control, the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"Soviet scientists, like many of our American colleagues," he said, "have come to the conclusion that the assertions of the leaders of the U.S. Administration that space-based 'defensive' weapons can protect the overwhelming majority of the country's population, hold no water." A far more effective protection against the nuclear threat would be an obligation by all nuclear states not to make first use of nuclear weapons, as has already been done by the Soviet Union, Rodionov said.

In the opinion of the Soviet expert the establishment of a space-based anti-missile system, even one with limited possibilities, tasks and scale, would undermine the Soviet-American Treaty of 1972 on the Limitation of Anti-Missile Defence Systems, a treaty which is playing an important stabilising role in the present complicated international situation. The preservation and faithful observance of this treaty is a guarantee of successful advance toward accords on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva.

The enormous funds planned by Washington for the preparation of "star wars" could be used with incomparably greater benefit for mankind, Stanislav Rodionov said in conclusion. They would help solve such important problems as the search for new sources of energy, environmental protection, combatting hunger and disease from which millions of people are suffering to this day.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

USSR SCIENTISTS AGAINST SPACE MILITARIZATION

LD121615 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 12 Jun 85

[*"Soviet Scientists Protest Against Space Militarization"--TASS headline]*

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS -- "Soviet scientists are unanimous in the opinion that space should be an arena of peace and cooperation", Valeriy Barsukov, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., told a TASS correspondent. He stressed that Soviet scientists did a lot to promote peace and curb the arms race.

A majority of American scientists with whom I have lately met and talked, Barsukov went on to say, are also convinced that space militarization is madness and a threat to the security of the United States itself. It is not accidental that 700 American scientists signed an address expressing their concern over the development of anti-satellite weapons and an anti-ballistic missile defense system with space-based elements.

There are many of my acquaintances among the signatories of the address. For many years now we have had meetings in the United States and the Soviet Union, the Soviet scientist said.

Not infrequently we conduct parallel development work to design the same instruments for the study of physical processes and phenomena taking place in the universe, spending a lot of efforts and funds. But the instruments are practically the same, Valeriy Barsukov said. If it wasn't for the complex international situation that deteriorated through the Reagan administration's fault we could pool our efforts in the study of many scientific problems, including energetics, environmental protection and space exploration.

Soviet science, and I can say so with assurance, has not suffered because of curtailed scientific contacts, Barsukov said. In the past few years the U.S.S.R. has achieved notable successes in the study of a number of planets, Venus, for example, and this enabled Soviet scientists to overtake their colleagues from other countries. This leadership is recognized by American specialists who sometimes have to repeat and plan research already carried out in the U.S.S.R. For instance, Soviet scientists have already compiled the map of Venus, while the Americans plan to do so in 1988.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

USSR MANUAL ON INTERNATIONAL SPACE LAW REVIEWED

PM171009 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Book review by O. Gazenko, academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences, reviewing "International Space Law" (Mezhdunarodnoye Kosmicheskoye Pravo), Moscow, International Relations Publishing House, 1985: "Legal Norms and Peaceful Outer Space"]

[Text] The spread of the arms race to space in the event of the implementation of the plans nurtured in Washington for the creation of space strike weapons could call into question any possibility of nuclear missile arms limitation and sharply step up the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war, which would threaten the existence of all living things on earth.

International law holds an important place among the means designed to ensure the exclusively peaceful exploitation of space. International space law, which has been in existence for some 3 decades, governs international cooperation in the cause of the peaceful exploration and utilization of space. That is why there is such interest in the first ever manual in the Soviet Union and abroad on international space law for students of higher educational establishments. The book was compiled by a team of leading Soviet experts in international law.

The section of the book dealing with the struggle of the USSR for a ban on the military use of outer space convincingly proves that, when common sense prevailed, important international agreements limiting the use of outer space for military purposes were reached. Thus, international legal norms were set to ban the testing of nuclear weapons in outer space, the launching into an orbit around the earth of objects with nuclear weapons or other types of mass destruction weapons.

The bilateral Soviet-U.S. agreements aimed at limiting the anti-ballistic missile defence systems and strategic offensive weapons also contain norms imposing quantitative and qualitative restrictions on the use of outer space with military aims. The commitments made by the USSR and the USA under these agreements provide, in particular, for a renunciation of the creation, testing, and deployment of systems or components of space-based anti-ballistic missile defense. The United States embarked on creating space weapons in crude violation of these international commitments. The manual devotes much space to the Soviet Union's numerous peace initiatives, whose implementation would place a reliable barrier in the way of a space weapons race.

Soviet diplomacy and the science of law played an active role in drawing up international agreements in the field of peaceful uses of outer space. Today they form the basis of law and order in outer space. The objective of these agreements is to prevent arbitrary rule in outer space and ensure the most favorable conditions for peaceful, creative activities for the benefit and in the interests of all states and peoples. Along with summarizing the principles and norms pertaining to the legal status of outer space and celestial bodies, the manual devotes much attention to new problems of international space law, which permanently crop up along with the development of cosmonautics and a broad use of its achievements in the economy: the legal regulation of live telecasting through satellites, long distance probing of the earth from outer space, the use in outer space of nuclear energy sources, the order of the deployment and operation of satellites in a geostationary orbit, etc.

Practical work for the exploration of outer space is now unthinkable without broad international cooperation. The book contains a detailed description of the international-legal mechanism and diverse forms of cooperation of states in the exploration and uses of outer space.

The Soviet Union firmly follows the course for the development of mutually beneficial cooperation with other countries in the exploration of outer space from the very start of the space era. The joint projects of the socialist countries under the "Intercosmos" programme, the successfully resolved projects in the course of cooperation with India, France, Sweden, and other countries have inscribed glorious pages in the history of world cosmonautics. In the 1970's Soviet-U.S. space research was successfully developing under the conditions of detente. Suffice it to recall the flight of Soviet and U.S. cosmonauts under the "Soyuz-Apollo project", which will be ten years old in July of this year. The constructive contribution made by the Soviet Union to the activities of international organizations in the field of study and practical uses of outer space is broadly recognized.

The new book by the Soviet international lawyers is not only an important teaching and reference aid, but a timely and necessary reminder that only a peaceful outer space paves the way for its purposeful study and exploitation in the interests of all people.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

USSR'S ZAGLADIN DISCUSSES SDI, EUROPEAN SECURITY

LD131101 Paris LE MATIN in French 10 Jun 85 pp 15-17

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, by Giorgio Fanti in Moscow--date not given]

[Excerpt] Georgio Fanti: Everything is changing in the world. We are on the threshold of the third millenium. How do you view this here in Moscow?

Vadim Zagladin: We will have 15 years in which to insure that, above all, it is different from the second. We experienced two world wars in the first half of the century alone and there is all the rest: the arms race and an unprecedented, constant confrontation.

Giorgio Fanti: So is peace a priority? Is it a priority to prevent Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]--"star wars?"

Vadim Zagladin: Undoubtedly. A war with modern weapons would lead to the biological destruction of the human race. Reagan's "star wars" would give it an even worse dimension and even greater specificity.

Giorgio Fanti: The U.S. Congress is slowing things down and we are as yet only at the stage of preliminary research....

Vadim Zagladin: That is only partly true. Some sectors of the SDI have already reached the experimental and practical phase. General Abrahamson, chief of the U.S. program, said so himself. Some of Reagan's aides maintain that one or two phases of the system can and even should be put into operation now.

Giorgio Fanti: Somebody wrote that you are afraid of that....

Vadim Zagladin: How ridiculous! Do they think we are not afraid of nuclear war, but afraid of that? Would the result not be the same. We talk about it with great concern because it would not only be a new type of weapon, but a new class of weapon, which would be global and at the same time selective. Between 200 and 300 nuclear bombs would suffice to destroy the earth. Space weapons can act everywhere and insure the impunity of the first strike. There are numerous documents to prove it: the instructions given to the U.S.

Air Force in January on the control of space and General R. Marsch's commentary: "The one who controls space controls the world." Then, of course, there was Reagan's speech to put forward the SDI, not to mention the various space war scenarios published in the United States.

Giorgio Fanti: If Reagan made the SDI operational, how would you react?

Vadim Zagladin: We would certainly not do the same thing. We would respond in a more effective way, first to defend ourselves and then to penetrate their system. But another and even more dangerous stage in the arms race would begin.

Giorgio Fanti: Is mutual space control not possible?

Vadim Zagladin: Space weapons cannot be monitored. It is already impossible to know with certainty whether or not a cruise missile is carrying a nuclear warhead. The only possible response to "star wars" is to ban it completely.

Giorgio Fanti: Reagan says it could make nuclear weapons unnecessary....

Vadim Zagladin: It is much easier and less costly to first destroy all types of nuclear weapons. What is more rational, just, and universally desired than the denuclearization of the earth?

Giorgio Fanti: In the dialogue and confrontation between the two superpowers, the problems discussed affect all countries, although they have no say in the matter....

Vadim Zagladin: That is not entirely true. All countries, especially the Europeans can and, I would say, should play their own role. How? By making their voice heard: The Madrid conference ended positively thanks to the role played by the Europeans. Western Europe has a major part to play.

Giorgio Fanti: But is it not time to talk about the whole of Europe as one entity? This is the only way it will really count. Let us for a moment put forward the hypothesis of a Europe grouping the Western and Eastern bloc countries, each equipped with the social regime of its choice. Would that not be a guarantee of cooperation and security for you too?

Vadim Zagladin: The two blocs exist; dissolving them simultaneously is a reasonable objective we have frequently proposed. But, to be realistic, we must work on the basis that they exist. We fully understand that there are countries which want to stay in NATO and, in fact, we are not asking them to leave. We are very sensitive and, I think, attentive to European questions, and we will have the opportunity to prove it.

Giorgio Fanti: The status quo has changed in the world, except in Europe. Is the time not right to see whether a change, acceptable to the West and the East, could break the deadlock in negotiations on disarmament?

Vadim Zagladin: This raises two problems. I have already mentioned the dissolution of the two blocs to free the continent of them....

Giorgio Fanti: In other words Finlandization....

Vadim Zagladin: Definitely not and, what is more, I reject the word, which has been adopted in a way which is offensive to Finland. The second problem relates to the division into two social systems, and here too we must be realistic and take account of the situation, rejecting the U.S. idea that this division is responsible for all the world's ills. However, leaving aside wisdom, which is a faculty rarely used in politics, experience is enough to show that cooperation between countries with different social systems is not only possible but useful. I would say that it is vital in view of World War II and the detente of the sixties, with the positive effects they had.

Giorgio Fanti: Could a European entity from the Atlantic to the Urals, among other things, defuse the negative aspect of German reunification, mentioned by Reagan"

Vadim Zagladin: Reagan is a European, I suppose?

Giorgio Fanti: But he is in a position to take it as his problem....

Vadim Zagladin: His desire to liquidate socialism is not new. This desire may lead him to express it, but it will not lead to a solution. Reagan is in a state of surrealistic abstraction.

Giorgio Fanti: But he can even determine your domestic policy. How can you implement your modernization programs with the vast spending involved and, at the same time, face up to space weapons?

Vadim Zagladin: As far as the SDI is concerned, it is not yet a reality, and let us hope it never will be. It is true that building our society and being able to defend it are two indivisible parts of our policy. However, at the CPSU congress and in the 12th Five-Year Plan we must take account of the need to maintain our defense system at maximum efficiency. I stress defense. We do not claim any supremacy. We simply want the balance to be maintained.

Giorgio Fanti: So, your domestic policy is influenced....

Vadim Zagladin: In the worst hypothesis (that the SDI is not abandoned) we would spend much less than the United States. We only have to defend ourselves, and that would cost 20 times less than the \$60 billion planned by the Pentagon. But it is true that our living standards will improve more rapidly if we do not have this additional burden on our shoulders.

CSO: 5200/1251

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OFFICIAL DENIES NATO IN CRISIS OVER SDI

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 24 May 85 p 2

[Op Ed article by Foreign Ministry Undersecretary Oddmund H. Hammerstad; "USA's Space Weapons Initiative: No Reason to Declare NATO Crisis"]

[Text] There is no reason to hide the fact that both the Norwegian government and the governments of most NATO countries have difficulties with the American Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Nevertheless, it is a long way from such an acknowledgement to declaring a crisis in the NATO alliance, such as representatives of the Labor Party have now obviously made up their minds to do. Storting Representative Knut Frydenlund was the first man out during a discussion meeting in Tromsø on 20 May.

NATO, with its multiplicity of organs and forums both on the official plane and on the political level, is a well tested and well suited organization for both debates and decisions. Storms have been ridden out before and will be ridden out again. An ability has been developed in this alliance organization to stick to the most important and concentrate more attention on what unites than what divides.

It is correct that the American president two years ago came out with his vision of a possible future non-nuclear defense against strategic offensive nuclear weapons without first having consulted his allies. The West European NATO countries have clearly expressed their opinion as to what they think of this. The Labor Party and perhaps especially Ex-Foreign-Affairs-Minister Knut Frydenlund, however, should make themselves a little less conspicuous. One is reminded of how the question of a nuclear-free zone in Scandinavia was handled both internally and in relation to Norway's allies when the issue was presented the first time. I will not say more about this issue but just mention that the implementation of a zone model such as the Labor Party government presented (the first time in Prime Minister Nordli's New Year's speech of 80/81) would have had distinct security policy and strategic implications for our allies.

Discussion

Concomitantly with the public debate on SDI, the NATO countries' representatives have of course also discussed internally all aspects of the issue over

the last two years. What has created a mood of crisis in individual media and in our largest opposition party is, I believe, associated with the Reagan administration's invitation to all its allies to take part in the SDI research program which starts in earnest this fall, as well as efforts on the part of the Americans to gain support for SDI research.

#### Difficult Process

The process which is now under way in many capitals is indeed both difficult and intense, but one can hardly talk of a crisis. Here at home the issue has been clarified on the government's part, including the letter which was sent to the Storting Foreign Affairs Committee with the "Government's Views on Weapons Systems for Use in Space." The formal answer to the USA will be waited with until after the issue has been debated in the Storting. Equivalent clarifications will gradually occur in the other NATO capitals, too, although it is still unclear whether the reaction to Washington will be individual or coordinated in one form or another. Accordingly, the Norwegian government's view is that it is not of current interest for Norway to take part in the USA's military program for space weapons research. But the government emphasizes at the same time that it is of great importance that Norwegian firms and institutions are able to establish research cooperation with both American and European research circles in high-technology fields like electronics, for example.

#### Without Crises

As far as the political and strategic aspects of SDI are concerned, these will certainly be with us for a rather long time to come; but with my knowledge of the NATO system, /this/ [in italics] side of the problem complex will also be managed without crises. Our American friends are, of course, capable of comprehending and testing the many views and arguments which have been adduced against aspects of SDI, especially against the concept as it was presented by President Reagan in March 1983. For this reason, then, the process has already come far in the direction of more flexible approaches to the question and strategic defense systems. The president's vision is being toned down and the space weapons part is becoming more an option if technology permits, if the system will be cost effective, if consultations with allies and dialogue/negotiations with the Soviet Union grant it, etc.

#### The American Dilemma

It is the more obvious and operational aspects of SDI which are gradually coming to the forefront when one talks with representatives of the American administration regarding the issue. It is not "Star Wars," but the American dilemma, as they themselves understand it, with vulnerability with a possible first strike, which dominates the thinking. Ever since President Carter presented his proposal for "deep cuts" in strategic nuclear weapons in 1977, solutions have been sought; more or less exotic ones, like, for example, "Shell Game" or "Race Tracks." The costs and effects on the environment torpedoed these proposals, but the logic, or the dilemma, is still there, and a solution is being sought in SDI. The SDI initiative must be seen also in

light of the subsequent report work by the so-called Scowcroft Commission. The commission presented a plan for deep cuts in offensive strategic systems, which the superpowers themselves regarded as most favorable, and with the overriding goal of making a transition from heavy multiple-head to smaller single-head missiles of the Midgetman type. This would considerably reduce the first-strike threat. However, there still remains the question of security with a first strike against decision centers. Here the need for a defense system enters the picture. However, it is not necessary to have a grandiose space-based system to solve this problem. A more limited defense system should be sufficient.

#### Want to Discuss

We know that the Russians are interested in discussing strategic defense with the Americans. It is probably for this reason that they lined up at the negotiating table again in Geneva. They would also rather stop the SDI research program, both because they would gladly maintain their near monopoly in this field, but certainly also because they realize what a technological leap the USA can now come to make in the future in by far most technology fields with both military and civilian applications. It will be quite central to the assessment of SDI both as a research program and strategic concept in the time to come, whether the USA in close consultation with its allies is able to get the Soviet Union to join in a dialogue. It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union is today developing a parallel to the American single-head Midgetman, i.e., the SSX-25. Strategic defense in one form or another can become part of a strategic compromise between the superpowers, in which are included deep cuts and the change to single-head intercontinental missiles, such as the Scowcroft plan prescribes. The result would be able to be greater stability at a lower level of strength.

Such a development will also take care of what is a central goal for the Norwegian government in this connection, i.e., to avoid a weapons race in space. And the solidarity in the alliance and the ability to solve difficult problems in cooperation will be demonstrated once again.

8985  
CSO: 5200/2629

SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN DEFENSE MINISTER DENIES JOINT PLANS WITH U.S.

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 30 May 85 pp A1, A22

[Article by Jim Robb]

[Text]

Defence Minister Erik Nielsen denied Wednesday that the United States is considering a new nuclear war plan and command structure that would draw Canada automatically into the controversial Star Wars scheme.

The New York Times reported that the U.S. Defence Department was devising a plan that would link offensive nuclear strike forces with the projected anti-missile defence envisaged in President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative.

Nielsen told the Commons that the published report "garbled totally fictitious events with some actual developments, which creates the very false impression of relevance to Star Wars, SDI, or whatever."

The defence minister slammed the report as "very misleading."

External Affairs spokesman Sean Brady said in an interview that Canada has received assurances from the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Defence Department that the U.S. joint chiefs of staff haven't considered "any such ideas" as those put forward in the published report.

He admitted that internal staff discussions without "official" status might have been held but said such talks would be "highly speculative" since they presuppose a

"workable" Star Wars anti-missile shield.

Brady, whose initial response Wednesday morning led reporters to conclude Canada was involved in discussions with the U.S. on a new war plan linking offensive nuclear weapons and a missile defence, explained that what the United States does have officially under consideration is "reassigning responsibilities" among three of its military commands which are "co-located" at Colorado Springs, Col., with NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defence Command, in which Canada is a partner.

Brady stressed, however, that the U.S. planning did not involve Star Wars in any way.

The External Affairs spokesman said Canada is being consulted on possible integration of the U.S. Air Defence Command, the U.S. Air Force space command and a new unified space command which exists now only on paper, because of possible future co-ordination with NORAD.

"They don't have to put the proposals to us," Brady said, because they involve only the U.S. military, but were doing so because of the NORAD partnership.

Brady said it is Canada's understanding that current U.S. planning would put the three commands under a new unified

space command, an enlarged version of the one that is supposed to become operational in October.

He said the Americans want to "co-ordinate U.S. military space assets" such as early-warning sensors and surveillance satellites under a centralized command.

"We're being consulted on the proposed reorganization," he said, but stressed that no concrete proposals have been put on the table by the Americans.

Brady said that External Affairs Minister Joe Clark had raised Canada's potential concerns about "ramifications" for Canada because of this country's joint role in NORAD when he met U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in Washington on May 20.

A U.S. State Department response to the Times story said that NORAD functions "remain as they have been for many years."

"Decisions on the future of NORAD, including its possible relation to the space command have not yet been made," the U.S. statement said. It added that "no such decision would be made without thorough consultations with Canada."

The NORAD agreement comes up for renewal in May, 1986, and the Mulroney government is committed to a thorough review of it.

Nielsen urged the New Democratic Party in the Commons Wednesday to prod the Liberals into agreeing to have the Commons committee on external affairs and defence give early consideration to the review.

Nielsen accused the Liberals of stalling on having the NORAD review take place.

NDP external affairs critic Pauline Jewett charged in the Commons that the report of a nuclear war command involving offensive and defensive systems meant Canada would "inexorably" be drawn into Star Wars through its NORAD connection.

Unconvinced by the defence minister's explanation, she told reporters outside the Commons that "the snowball is going to go all the way down the hill" and involve testing and deployment as well as research.

CSO: 5220/11

SPACE ARMS

OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO STAR WARS PARTICIPATION

Government-Sponsored Committee

Ottawa THE WEEKEND CITIZEN in English 25 May 85 p 2

[Article by David Lord]

[Text]

Members of a government-sponsored, consultative committee on arms control have warned the Canadian government that deployment of missile defences by both the United States and Soviet Union could increase the militarization of Canadian territory, put pressure on Canadian sovereignty and increase Canada's defence budget.

The group of former ambassadors, academics, disarmament organization spokesmen, labor leaders and others also says that missile defences such as the U.S. Star Wars plan for space-based weapons could ultimately "weaken, rather than strengthen the prospects for achieving a safer global security system."

Included in the group are: Geoffrey Pearson, Canada's former ambassador to Moscow; John Halstead, former NATO ambassador; Russell Legge, president of the Canadian Council of Churches; and George Ignatieff, former disarmament ambassador.

Pearson now is director of the government-funded Canadian Institute for International

### Peace and Security.

The recommendations of the committee have been turned over to Arthur Kroeger, a top civil servant named by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark to study a U.S. invitation to Canada to participate in Star Wars research, Disarmament Ambassador Doug Roche told a Commons committee Friday.

The United States has asked its allies to join in the Star Wars research — a multi-billion-dollar scheme to study the feasibility of space-based weapons to destroy Soviet missiles as they lift off or in space.

Attached to the recommendations from the committee were minutes from its April 11-12 meeting, where participants warned that Star Wars could destabilize East-West relations, provide few economic benefits for Canada and be ultimately unfeasible.

Members of the committee said the Star Wars project could endanger the U.S.-Soviet anti-ballistic missile treaty, until now largely credited by experts as being a curb on the militarization of space by both superpowers. It could be difficult to differentiate between re-

search and actual development of the weapons, and the high-tech shield of particle-beam, and laser weapons may not be "leak-proof."

A statement from the members of the committee said they "wish to make known to the government of Canada their concern about the gathering momentum in superpower efforts to achieve the capability to deploy ballistic missile defence systems."

The "grave risks" involved in such development, they said, include diverting energy now being directed to halting the arms race, the "weaponization of outer space," the undermining of current arms control talks and the possible violation of the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Anti-missile development could also reverse a tentative thaw in East-West relations and strain the Atlantic Alliance, they said.

Kroeger was not available for comment.

The committee added that "if the decision on Canadian participation in (Star Wars) is negative, no government support should go to research connected to the program."

### University Scientists, Engineers

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 14 May 85 p 4

[Article by Stephen Strauss]

[Text]

Growing opposition by scientists and engineers to Canadian participation in the United States' so-called Star Wars initiative has produced its third petition in two weeks.

About 749 people at a number of Canadian universities have signed a petition circulated from the University of British Columbia saying the space-based initiative will destabilize the world and lead to a new arms race. They ask Canada not to join in research to develop the system and add that, if it does, "we will not co-operate."

The petition, which was sent to the Prime Minister, the leaders of the opposition, and a number of ministers last Friday, follows on the heels of a similar petition from McMaster University. Among that petition's signers was university president Alvin Lee.

A week earlier, 40 members of the University of Toronto's department of computer science had sent their own petition. This suggested that the plan, officially known as the Strategic Defence Initiative,

was too dependent on computers. The computers are needed because the proposed system will have to react to as many as 2,000 missiles within three minutes of their launch.

The Toronto petition said this means the response "must be essentially automatic. A swift, automatic response requires a large and complex system, and using present technology it is not possible to specify and construct so complex a system and be sure it will work."

Professor Luis Sobrino, one of the signers of the UBC petition, says opposition to Canadian participation in Star Wars cuts across often-polarized British Columbia politics.

"People who are quite right wing from a social-political point of view get quite upset about this," he said in a telephone interview.

One irony of the opposition to the SDI plan is that those who oppose it are often candidates for some of the multi-billion dollar research associated with the plan.

Liberal Task Force Hearings

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 31 May 85 p 21

[Article by Donn Downey]

[Text]

The Strategic Defence Initiative, a U.S. research project the Reagan Administration says will render nuclear weapons obsolete, will increase rather than decrease the threat of nuclear war, a group from the University of Toronto's computer science department said yesterday.

The group — two professors and a graduate student — was addressing a federal Liberal task force on peace, security and world disarmament which is holding hearings in six Canadian cities. The hearings yesterday were at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre.

Task force chairman Jean Chrétien, opposition critic on external affairs, said during a break in the hearings that SDI, or Star Wars, is the dominant concern in Toronto, Vancouver and Winnipeg, where the group has met so far.

He said the Liberals opposed Canadian participation when SDI first was mentioned in the Commons and he understands that the Conservative Government and the NDP did too. Since then, the Government has been less sure.

Professor Eric Hehner of the U of T told the task force that SDI is a defensive countermeasure to nuclear attack from ballistic missiles and is based on new developments in computers' "artificial intelligence." But it is absolutely necessary to get the software right, he said. "Unfortunately, it is not possible."

"For SDI, the consequence of (a computer) misinterpreting data or making a dumb strategic move could very well be the start of a nuclear holocaust."

SDI takes into account the possibility of human error by having another program called a verifier. "But a verifier, being a large program itself, may well contain bugs .... The proposed SDI software to recognize, evaluate and respond to nuclear attack, according to (U.S.) Defence Department estimates, will be about eight million lines of code. Without a doubt, it will contain a lot of bugs," Prof. Hehner said.

Andrew Gullen, a U of T graduate student, sketched a scenario in which the defence system could accidentally launch a nuclear war. "The ballistic missile defence system forces a drastic reduction in the decision times available to the two sides .... With SDI, we are looking at decision times measured in seconds. This is far too fast for ... human judgment."

The United States has asked Canada and its other allies to participate in the SDI research. The invitation, issued by U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger on March 25, gave the allies two months to respond. Since then, SDI has become a hot subject for debate in many NATO countries and, although the deadline has passed, Canada has not yet given the United States an answer.

The task force will also hold hearings in Montreal, Halifax and Ottawa.

CSO: 5220/10

SPACE ARMS

CANADA: NO DECISION ON STAR WARS PARTICIPATION YET

Prime Minister's Response

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 7 May 85 p A3

[Article by Joel Ruimy]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has denied allegations that the government already has decided to participate in research on the controversial Star Wars defence project.

New Democratic Party leader Ed Broadbent raised the question in the House of Commons yesterday, brandishing a letter from a man he would identify only as a "former senior scientist who worked for the government of Canada."

The letter says the National Research Council "has already been informed that Canada will participate in the American program of research for Star Wars and that the (research council) will act as the point of contact in Canada for co-operation between the two countries."

The council allegedly also has been told to allocate \$6 million toward the project, and Broadbent

said he verified with the author that the money would be for Star Wars and not for non-military space research.

But Mulroney replied that "with deference to the individual, who is no doubt distinguished, the facts are completely at variance with the contents of that letter."

Science Minister Tom Siddon and a research council spokesman also denied the NDP allegations.

Up to now, the government has said it is "prudent" for the United States to proceed with research on Star Wars, the common name for the proposed space-based defence system.

But Mulroney has expressed personal reservations about actually participating in that research. Officially, his government still is considering a U.S. invitation to join the \$26 billion project.

Broadbent refused to show reporters the full text of the letter, or to name the scientist who wrote it.

Foreign Minister's Statement

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 10 May 85 p A8

[Text] Ottawa (CP)--Canada may not respond to a U.S. invitation to participate in Star Wars research until the middle or end of June, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark says. The United States had hoped for a reply from Canada and other allies by May 26.

But Canada intends "to come to a reasonable, educated conclusion on our own timetable, not somebody else's," Clark told the House of Commons external affairs committee yesterday.

The U.S. invited its allies in March to participate in research into space-based weapons formally called the Strategic Defence Initiative.

CSO: 5220/09

SPACE ARMS

GREEN PAPER SPARKS CONTROVERSY ON STAR WARS ISSUE

Government Green Paper

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 15 May 85 p A19

[Excerpts]

The following is a partial text of the federal government's green paper, entitled *Directions for Canada's International Relations*, released yesterday by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark.

The world is changing and so is Canada . . . In 1970 (when the last full review of Canadian foreign policy was published), a different world seemed to be shaping up from the one that actually emerged. Fifteen years ago American economic preeminence was being challenged, optimism about economic prosperity was widely shared, and detente seemed to hold the key to more fruitful relations between East and West.

Forecasting is as fraught with difficulties today as it was in 1970. American economic performance continues to defy conventional economic thinking. Will it do so indefinitely and, if not, will the change be dizzying or gentle? What does the international revolution in financial services mean to the international economy and to our own? Will the debt problem be resolved? How will the generational shift in Soviet leaders affect U.S.S.R. policy both at home and towards the West? How will new technologies affect the arms race and strategic doctrines? Are crisis-management mechanisms adequate for the challenge ahead? On these most basic issues there are no certainties. The extent of this uncertainty underscores the importance of flexibility in policy formulation and implementation.

. . . The United States will remain the world's dominant economic power. It will also remain our most important ally and market. The Pacific Rim will outpace the rest of the world in economic growth. Competition at home and in our export markets will be fierce. The poor and hungry of the Third World will continue to need assistance. Europe will remain divided between East and West for some time to come. Collective security will remain necessary. Interdependence will deepen.

If we are to make our way successfully, we must ask ourselves the right questions about what we want and about what we can achieve. We do not have the resources to do everything. We face tough choices which go to the heart of our national life. To succeed, we need to develop a national consensus on handling the critical international challenges before us. . . .

**Security Priorities**

Nothing is more fundamental to statehood than the ability to exert control over sovereign territory. And nothing is more fundamental to a state's security than the ability to mount a defense against a potential aggressor. . . . Today, however, no state, not even a superpower, can alone guarantee its security. As a consequence, alliances are necessary and national efforts need to be adapted to take account of alliance requirements.

Control over our national territory, airspace and coastal waters is essential. . . . To be effective, control requires a surveillance and detection system able to provide a continuing picture of activities on land, in the air and at sea. Control also requires a capability to intercept aircraft and ships engaged in unauthorized or illegal activity. . . . In our case, it is a daunting task, considering . . . the vastness of our territory . . . and the disproportionately small size of our population. . . .

Europe remains the most critical military region in the world. It is where the line is drawn most graphically between East and West, it is where the task of deterring aggression must start, and it is where we have stationed forces for 35 years as one component of our contribution to NATO and collective defence. Maintaining deterrence in Europe, without undue reliance on nuclear weapons, requires that the conventional military imbalance in favor of the Warsaw Pact be rectified. In the absence of a balanced force reduction, there is a case for increasing the effectiveness of the Canadian contribution to collective defence in Europe and the government is taking steps in this direction. An additional 1,200 military personnel are to be stationed in Europe in the next year. An infantry battalion group in Canada is to be dedicated to the Allied Command Europe (ACE) Mobile Force, a multinational NATO deterrent force intended to reinforce Europe in time of crisis. . . .

New concepts of strategic defence raise important defence and arms control issues. At present, much about strategic defence remains hypothetical, and the defensive systems of both East and West are on the agenda for Soviet/American arms control negotiations. In addition, the United States is committed not to proceed beyond research (permitted under the ABM treaty) without discussion and negotiation. Since the Soviet Union has a research program of its own in this field and took up the option provided for in the ABM treaty to deploy a limited ABM system, it seems only prudent that the United States itself keep abreast of the feasibility of ballistic missile defence. . . .

#### **Arms Control and Disarmament**

There is a widespread consensus in Canada that defence and deterrence are only one dimension of international security and that effective arms control and disarmament agreements are a necessary complement. Questions which Canadians need to ask themselves relate to the balance to be struck between these two dimensions and to how we can use our influence — as a country serious about peace, skilled at mediation and negotiation and technically proficient — in the quest for international security.

The challenge is to translate our desire for progress into action that leads to practical agreements. . . . We must also recognize that, although our ultimate objective is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we may have to live with and to rely on them for many years to come. . . .

Committee Participation Refusal

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 17 May 85 pp 1, 2

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Excerpts]

OTTAWA — The federal Government might not make a decision on participation in Star Wars research for another three or four months, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said yesterday. And in the meantime, it would like to hear the views of average Canadians.

Last week, Mr. Clark indicated that the Government would be in a position to decide by the end of June on whether Canada will take part in the research for Washington's proposed space-based strategic defence system.

But he told reporters yesterday that "we have to make a decision sometime in the next three or four months. . . It would be very helpful to us to receive the views of Canadians as one element on which we base our judgment."

Mr. Clark said that an appropriate forum would be a special Commons-Senate committee on foreign policy, which the Government proposed to create to study Ottawa's green paper review of foreign policy, published Tuesday.

In the Commons yesterday, Mr. Clark accused the opposition parties of trying to deny Canadians a forum to express their views on Canadian participation in Star Wars research, closer trade links with the United States and other aspects of foreign policy.

The Liberals and the New Democratic Party have said they will not participate in the proposed joint committee because Mr. Clark's green paper does not deal with the Star Wars issue.

The major foreign-policy issue of national defence is not addressed in the green paper, indicating that the Government is not serious about public discussion of the issue, the

Liberals and NDP critics said Tuesday.

"We do not want to be a party to a fraud on the people of Canada," Liberal Leader John Turner said in explanation for the opposition boycott of the committee.

It is "showing contempt for the people of Canada" to hold foreign-policy review hearings on the green paper when the Cabinet will have already decided the Star Wars research question, NDP Leader Edward Broadbent said.

The opposition boycott means that there cannot be any public hearings because there cannot be a committee, Mr. Clark told the House.

### Clark Remarks

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 20 May 85 p A1

#### [Text]

WASHINGTON (CP) — The debate over Star Wars in Canada and other countries means many important foreign policy questions are being neglected, a frustrated External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said yesterday.

Clark, who arrived here for talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, said he will bring up his concerns about the attention being paid to Star Wars when the two meet today.

Despite signs that Canada will participate in Star Wars — the nickname for the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative of research into a space-based defence system against nuclear weapons — Clark said Canada is neutral for now.

"We haven't made a decision," he said in a poolside interview yesterday at Canadian Ambassador Allan Gotlieb's residence.

Clark said Shultz shares his view that there is too much focus on Star Wars in Canada and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries at the expense of other issues.

"I'm going to talk about some of the implications of the debate on the alliance, particularly the preoccupation with SDI to the exclusion of other questions," Clark said, singling out arms control issues as those that are being neglected.

U.S. State Department officials said Shultz does not plan to press Clark for an answer on whether Canada will participate but wants to discuss it in any case.

CSO: 5220/10

SPACE ARMS

AUSTRALIAN OFFICIALS REITERATE SDI OBJECTION

Foreign Minister Hayden

BK140809 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] The foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, has repeated Australia's objections to President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, the so-called "star wars" program. Mr Hayden told officials of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Brussels that Australia did not endorse any aspect of the program. He told NATO's acting secretary general, Mr (Eric Darin), that Australia opposed not only the deployment of weapons in space, but also research on the plan.

Officials said afterward that Mr Hayden had repeated the message given to senior United States officials by the prime minister, Mr Hawke, last month, that was, that Australia opposed the Star Wars concept and would have no part in it. Mr Hayden in his discussions with NATO officials also talked about the situation of NATO countries practicing nonnuclear defense policies.

Defense Minister Beazley

BK120851 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Text] The minister for defense, Mr Beazley, has reaffirmed the Australian Government's opposition to involving itself in the United States space defense program popularly known as the "star wars" program. But he said today the government was under no pressure to respond in writing to the 3-month-old U.S. request for allied countries to contribute to the scheme.

Mr Beazley told the National Press Club luncheon in Canberra that a number of aspects of the "star wars" program worried the government. Among these were the massive deployment of force in order to circumvent such a defense system and the arms control considerations flowing from that. There were also problems of command and control. However, Radio Australia's Canberra office says Mr Beazley failed to give a full explanation of why Australia had not yet officially answered Washington's request.

CSO: 5200/4334

SPACE ARMS

JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER, EC OFFICIAL DISCUSS SDI

OW170812 Tokyo KYODO in English 0712 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo, 17 Jun (KYODO)--The European Community considers the United States' Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) a formidable challenge to Western European technology, EC Commission Vice President Karl-Heinz Narjes said Monday.

In a meeting with Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, Narjes said the EC hopes to draw up a strategy to counter the American technological challenge in time for the EC summit in Milan 28-29 June.

The EC vice president made the remarks when asked by Nakasone about "Eureka," an ambitious European technological project proposed by French President Francois Mitterrand, a Foreign Ministry official said. West Germany and Britain have expressed their support for the French initiative, which, unlike the SDI with its strong military implications, is aimed only at achieving commercial applications of modern technology.

Nakasone emphasized that Japan understands the reasons for U.S. interest in SDI research but has not yet decided whether to participate in such research, the official said.

On trade, Narjes said the EC is awaiting Japan's action program designed to open its market wider to imports with "strong hope and expectations," according to the Japanese official. The EC suffered an annual trade deficit of over \$10 billion with Japan in both 1983 and 1984.

Nakasone noted that Japan's direct investment in EC member countries jumped 74 percent last year over the previous year to \$1.54 billion, creating jobs in the manufacturing and other sectors.

He also added that Japan is prepared to expand its technological cooperation from nuclear fusion to other fields of mutual interest, the Foreign Ministry official said.

Narjes, a specialist in industrial relations, information and technology, arrived in Tokyo Sunday on a 3-day visit.

CSO: 5200/08

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

AUSTRALIAN OPPOSITION HITS SDI DECISION--The federal opposition has condemned as irresponsible the Australian Government's decision to turn down an offer to participate in President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, or so-called "star wars" program. The opposition spokesman on foreign affairs, Mr MacPhee, says that in opposing the plan, the government is resigning itself to what he calls a world existing under the perpetual terror of massive nuclear retaliation. The criticism follows an address by the foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Brussels, where he reaffirmed that Australia did not endorse any aspects of the program. Mr MacPhee said research into antimissile system based in space involved moving away from a deterrence based on the doctrine of mutual assured destruction. Mr MacPhee said it was in Australia's interests to participate in research into the system because access would be gained to the latest technology with benefits for both civilian and defense purposes. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 14 Jun 85 BK]

JAPAN SAID INTERESTED IN EUREKA--Brussels, 19 Jun (AFP)--Japan has expressed interest in participating in West Europe's Eureka high technology research project, the Executive Commission of the European Economic Community (EEC) announced here today. A Commission communique said Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone indicated his government's interest in possible cooperation with the Community during a meeting in Tokyo earlier this week with Commission Vice President Karl-Heinz Narjes. Mr Narjes' visit to Japan between 15 and 18 June produced an EEC-Japanese accord to strengthen high level scientific cooperation, notably in the field of controlled thermonuclear fusion, the communique said. Meetings of experts are planned over the next few months. [Text] [Paris AFP in English 1622 GMT 19 Jun 85 AU]

JAPAN, BELGIUM CONFER ON SDI--Tokyo, 27 May (KYODO)--The Belgian Government has not decided on whether it will take part in U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research, but it may allow private enterprises to do so, Japanese officials said Monday. The Belgian Government made clear its position on the SDI project, known as "Star Wars," during disarmament talks with Japan at the Foreign Ministry here Monday. Belgium sent Alfred Cahen, director general for political affairs in the Foreign Ministry, to the 1-day consultations with Japan, which was represented by Chusei Yamada, chief of the Foreign Ministry's UN bureau. Japanese officials quoted the Belgian side as saying it is legally difficult for the government to forbid private firms from participating in the SDI research. Japan has held similar consultations this year with West Germany, France and the United States. [Text] [Tokyo KYODO in English 1005 GMT 27 May 85]

CSO: 5200/07

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: REAGAN SALT II DECISION HIDES INTENTION TO DROP TREATY

Open or Covert Renunciation Foreseen

LD102015 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 10 Jun 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov; announcer-read]

[Text] Information from Washington. Today President Reagan will inform the U.S. Congress of his decision on the question of what is to become of the Soviet-U.S. treaties on limiting strategic arms. We are talking about the Soviet-American ABM treaty of 1972 and the SALT II treaty of 1979. These are extremely important documents. They now constitute probably the only international legal obstacle on the path of a further buildup of nuclear missile armaments. In Washington they are sweating to finally get rid of this obstacle too, and thereby to explode the very basis of international stability.

At present in America they are discussing the question merely of how to do it openly--that is, publicly to renounce concluded treaties--or, as THE NEW YORK TIMES puts it, by means of considered deviations from them--that is, on the sly, as it were. The first option--that is, an open denunciation of the Soviet-American treaty--is favored by the extreme militarist circles of the U.S., led by Defense Secretary Weinberger. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, the President's National Security Adviser MacFarlane, and some others, are for a more diplomatic, that is to say, cunning, option. They would like to achieve the same end, but by means of so-called modifications of SALT II, in other words, by revising it and emasculating it from within.

These dangerous schemes, as you know, have encountered a fairly decisive rebuff both in the U.S. Congress and among Washington's NATO allies. This was made clear to Shultz during the recent NATO Council session in Portugal. If Reagan does not adhere to the provisions of SALT II, the British FINANCIAL TIMES writes, the world will come to a pessimistic conclusion about his real intentions at the Geneva talks. But that is to put it too delicately. The world already has every ground for pessimistic conclusions regarding the U.S. positions at the Geneva talks. Just look at what is happening. In Geneva talks are taking place about stopping the arms race on earth and preventing one in space; and at the same time, hiding behind these talks as if they were a fig leaf, Washington is fighting for a final renunciation of all obstacles to the arms race both on earth and in space. For this is the essence of the Washington administration's attempts to bury by one means or another the Soviet-U.S. accords on strategic arms limitation.

So, let us wait and see what President Reagan will have to say about this. If a decision is taken across the ocean to renege on the Soviet-American treaties, then Washington--as PRAVDA writes--will bear the responsibility for all the consequences of this reckless step.

'Crawling Out' of Agreement

LD140107 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] The United States administration pursues a policy of crawling out of the SALT II treaty signed in 1979. Such is the official Soviet point of view based on real facts. Our observer Vladislav Kozyakov discusses some of them in his weekly comment:

After coming to office in 1981 the Republican administration refused to ratify the SALT II treaty. Simultaneously it announced a strategic nuclear forces modernization program worth \$180 billion. It included the development and deployment of new types of first strike weapons. It was clear from the very beginning that the program provided for such a tremendous nuclear buildup which of course exceeded the limits fixed by the SALT II treaty. To calm the public the White House promised at that time to respect the unratified treaty, but the promise was insincere. It was accompanied by intensive nuclear preparations which were aimed not at complying with the treaty but at achieving a military superiority.

Here are just a few facts to illustrate the point. First, the protocol to the SALT II treaty says that each party undertakes not to deploy sea-based and ground-based long-range cruise missiles. The United States ignored this agreement and started deploying its cruise missiles in the Navy and even in other countries. This was a serious blow at the process of the limitation of nuclear weapons as a whole. Actually, the United States initiated the building of a new class of strategic nuclear armaments. There are thousands of long-range cruise missiles today. This makes the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons even more complicated than before.

Second, Article 12 of the SALT II treaty says, I quote, in order to ensure the viability and effectiveness of this treaty each party undertakes not to circumvent the provisions of the treaty through any other state or states, or in any other manner, unquote.

The United States violated this agreement as well. Washington deployed more than 100 new nuclear missiles in Federal Germany, Britain, Italy, and Belgium, that is, near the territory of the Soviet Union and its allies. This means that the United States has added more than 100 nuclear launchers to its strategic arsenals. This is a circumvention of the SALT II treaty through other countries, forbidden by Article 12 of the treaty.

Third, Article 4, Provision 9, of the SALT II treaty says that each party may flight-test and deploy one new type of light intercontinental ballistic missile. The United States has already built one new type of strategic missile, the MX missile, and the second one, the Midgetman missile, is being developed.

These are some of the facts showing that the United States administration is crawling out of the SALT II treaty and scrapping its provisions one by one. Against this background the decision of the White House to take an old Poseidon submarine out of service when a new Trident submarine goes to sea looks as a propaganda gesture which does not change anything. Moreover, the decision is accompanied by the order to further augment the \$180 billion strategic nuclear forces program, and also by instructions to continue with the "star wars" program, which is incompatible with the 1972 Antiballistic Missiles Treaty.

The American policy of destroying the system of strategic arms limitation agreements is going on despite the tragic consequences it may have for the whole of mankind.

Weekly Talk Show 14 June

LD142218 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Jun 85

[*"International Situation: Questions & Answers"* program presented by All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator Yevgeniy Viktorovich Kachanov, with NOVOSTI political observer Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov]

[Excerpt] SALT II Treaty

[Kachanov] Our program receives many letters condemning the dangerous policies of the present U.S. administration in the international arena. Such letters have been received, in particular, from Vasiliy Romanovich Dmitriyev, a war veteran living in Pavlodar; from listener Pastukhova in the town of Vyazniki in Vladimir Oblast; from Vladimir Trofimovich Luzhko from Konotop, and many others. No demagogic talk by the Reagan administration can hide from world public opinion its wish to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union. Further evidence of this is the behavior of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, stresses Vyacheslav Nezanoskiy, a teacher from Vologda. Lidiya Vladimirovna Vlasova, a listener in Kaluga, recalls that some time ago massive public protests forced the Pentagon to abandon its plans for the deployment of neutron weapons in Western Europe. Reagan's present program, the objective of which is to create strike space armaments, is still more dangerous to the cause of peace. Our listener in Kaluga calls for peace-loving public opinion in all countries to redouble its efforts to persistently explain to all who have so far been indifferent the terrible threat the militarization of outer space will entail to the cause of peace.

Many letter writers rightly say that the testing, which is now beginning, of components in the system of antimissile defense which has space-based elements is a direct violation of the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty. Yet this treaty is the most important agreement in the field of arms control. Treaties must be observed. This norm of relations between countries was established by mankind longer ago than one can remember, writes our regular listener Vadim Vasilev from Leningrad. However, he continues, recent events show that Washington does not regard any accords as being a barrier on its path to world domination. Indeed, as you know, the Reagan administration intends to amputate vitally important provisions of the SALT II treaty, which, so to say, hampers the

buildup of the U.S. military potential. A debate is now in progress in Washington about the fate of this agreement, whose full name is the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. What is the position of the participants in this debate? I am putting this question to a participant in our program, Edgar Anatoliyevich Cheporov, a political observer for the NOVOSTI news agency.

[Cheporov] The most revealing thing here, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, is the way in which official Washington raises the question of the need to revise the SALT II treaty, an agreement, it should be noted, that has not in fact been ratified by the Reagan administration. This approach is a logical consequence of the U.S. arms race policy, its policy of achieving military superiority over the USSR. Since the treaty is a barrier to implementing these adventurist aims, its reexamination was demanded. Even before he took office, President Reagan described the SALT II treaty as being fatally flawed. Very recently, on 10 May this year, he said there is no need for the United States to go on observing the SALT II treaty. There is a debate within the administration about whether the treaty's obligations should be renounced altogether or whether the renunciation should be done in stages. The reaction to this discussion, both in the United States itself and in the camp of the U.S. allies, has proved to be extremely negative. The Senate, for example, adopted a resolution calling on the administration to desist from undermining existing agreements in the field of offensive strategic arms.

Senator Edward Kennedy declared that those who are seeking to undermine the SALT II treaty are more concerned with finding ways to block the process of arms limitation than with the security of Americans. Washington cannot, of course, ignore the views of its Atlantic partners either. That is why in his policy statement on 10 June the President did not dare announce an open, categorical renunciation of his obligations. But does this make any real difference? The other day an editorial in THE WASHINGTON POST said: Reagan is balancing between fiercely competing groups within his administration. Basically, what he is saying to Secretary of State Shultz and the other supporters of the policy of refusing to undermine the treaty is: I am giving you 5 months to demonstrate that this will lead to similar restraint on the part of the USSR, to the Soviet Union's adopting an honest approach at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. To Defense Secretary Weinberger, the paper went on, and other figures who would like to consign the SALT II treaty to the rubbish heap he said: Be patient for 5 months. Then you can tell me what further steps in the construction of armaments would be an appropriate and balanced response to the military consequences of Soviet violations which it has not been possible to eliminate.

The reason for Reagan's balancing act is quite obvious. Washington intends to use the SALT II treaty as an instrument to put pressure on the USSR at the Geneva talks. It turns out that the Americans will carry out their obligations depending on whether, in their view, the Russians behave well at Geneva.

But this is overt blackmail, blackmail that is backed up with the threat to start a massive undermining of the SALT II treaty. In keeping the balance between the doves and the hawks, the President is heading for one objective:

to destroy the system of treaties that restrains the arms race. The conditions and reservations that the U.S. President is attaching to fulfillment of the treaty show that, as the TASS statement notes, the United States has finally decided to gradually crawl out of the treaty and to cast off the restrictions imposed by it, one by one. It intends to amputate its vitally important provisions to the extent that they impede the implementation of planned programs for the creation and buildup of strategic armaments.

[Kachanov] Edgar Anatoliyevich, I do not think it would be amiss to recall which specific accords Washington strikes at with its policy.

#### Soviet-U.S. Parity

[Cheporov] When the SALT II treaty was signed, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, an approximate parity in the quantity and quality of the two powers' strategic nuclear armaments had become a generally recognized fact. During the process of drafting the treaty, experts from both sides came to the conclusion that there was an approximate equality in carriers. One side had 2,500 and the other side had about 2,300. The United States had and still has more nuclear warheads. However, when it took over from the Carter administration, which signed the treaty, Reagan's team began claiming that there was no equality between the USSR and the United States, and that the USSR had greatly overtaken the United States in strategic armaments.

The falsity of these claims was obvious. After all, it is inconceivable that in just 1 or 2 years the Soviet Union could have achieved superiority, let alone a substantial superiority, in strategic arms, which take many years to create. Or perhaps they uncovered some unexpected facts, which had not been taken into account before. No, no new facts of this kind had appeared.

Here is another aspect of the problem. In its comparison of the number of munitions available to the nuclear forces, the Pentagon deliberately underestimates the U.S. total by almost 2,000 units. On the other hand, it exaggerates the Soviet total by including munitions that the Pentagon believes may appear in the future. I would also add that Washington is including the Soviet medium bomber, known in the West as "Backfire," in the total of strategic armaments, even though the United States itself admitted that this aircraft has nothing to do with strategic armaments when it signed the SALT II treaty. At the same time, they are ignoring the existence of U.S. forward-based nuclear systems. Such a system of calculating the strength of the two sides cannot fail to give rise to a startling disparity in evaluations emanating from the U.S. ruling circles. On several occasions one authoritative figure has claimed that the Russians have a fivefold advantage in a certain type of strategic armaments, at the same time that another was assuring everybody that the advantage was in fact eightfold. Then evidence would appear that discredited both sets of far-fetched figures.

For example, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger stated that the Russians are many times stronger. But in their report to Congress in 1984, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces acknowledged the following: At present, there is an approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, one should bear in mind that such information is published for a select group of people, whereas the speeches about the imaginary superiority of the Russians are intended for the millions.

### Soviet, U.S. Violations

[Kachanov] Well, in planning violations of treaty obligations, the administration intends to present them as measures that are allegedly being taken in retaliation for so-called Soviet violations. What are the arguments about mythical Soviet violations based on?

[Cheporov] Neither the President nor his entourage can, of course, produce any weighty proof of such violations. But when it comes to fabrications and disinformation, the U.S. leaders lack nothing. Here is a typical example: Washington claims that the Soviet Union has a second, a new type of ICBM, the SS-25 missile. It pretends that the old SS-13 missile, which is being modernized in strict conformity with the SALT II treaty, is a new missile. References to this Soviet missile are being made in order to give the United States the right to violate one of the key provisions of the treaty by developing yet another strategic missile, the Midgetman, in addition to the MX missile. Incidentally, Washington decided to develop this missile and announced its decision long before the fabrications about the SS-25 missile were put about. There is only one purpose behind the charges against the USSR: to distract public attention from real breaches of the SALT II treaty by the United States itself. An example is the deployment of Pershing II ballistic missiles and cruise missiles in Western Europe. These first-strike nuclear weapons, which can strike targets inside the Soviet Union, are a clear addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear potential and undermine the strategic balance between our countries, which is prescribed by the SALT II treaty.

The "star wars" program pursues the same goal, the achievement of military superiority over the USSR. Together with the buildup of offensive strategic weapons, this program envisages the creation of strike space weapons and a large-scale system of so-called antimissile defense.

In August this year, the Pentagon intends to begin sea trials of the new nuclear submarine Alaska, which will carry 24 MIRVed Trident missiles. By arming itself with this new submarine-missile complex, the United States will break through the threshold of 1,200 strategic multiple warhead missiles set by the SALT-II treaty.

The Soviet position on Reagan's statement about the SALT II treaty is clear. We believe both sides should unswervingly observe the accords. Washington must clearly understand the consequences of the White House stand on the SALT II treaty. It should not be deluded into thinking that the United States will be allowed to arbitrarily decide which obligations will be observed and which will not. It is a dangerous delusion to expect that the other side will play along with this line of the United States. The Soviet Union will draw corresponding conclusions from all this, which are dictated by the interests of its security and the security of its allies.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Edgar Anatoliyevich.

Aimed at Misleading Public

LD160308 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Text] Lately the United States media have been paying a great deal of attention to the SALT II treaty between the USSR and the United States, and President Reagan's decision taken in connection with the fact that the treaty is expiring. The signs are that the presidential statement was aimed primarily at misleading public opinion at home. For many days in advance of the announcement of his decision controversy was whipped up over SALT II in the United States.

The American public was led to believe that the councils of the opponents of the treaty were prevailing in Washington. The treaty as you may know, has never been ratified by the United States Senate and its opponents want the United States to stop adhering to its provisions. After that psychological barrage the decision announced by the President appeared to millions of people, alarmed at the prospect of a runaway rams race to have been a gesture of good will and peaceful intent. It may appear to some people that President Reagan has succeeded to overcome broad opposition to SALT II and decided to continue to adhere to the treaty's terms to make sure that the arms race does not get out of control.

Actually the President's decision is no more than a further step toward taking apart the system that curbs the arms race, and one that took many years of hard bargaining to arrive at. The SALT II treaty is merely the first target. Opposing the treaty openly as Ronald Reagan did when the treaty was being drawn up and signed, would now be a tactical mistake, causing innumerable political implications at home and abroad. The Senate passed a resolution by a clear majority demanding that the treaty be complied with in the future, before the President announced his decision.

America's partners told Washington in no uncertain terms that the consequences of dropping the treaty would be negative. In the circumstances the decision was taken not to destroy the treaty in one fell swoop, but to take it apart step by step to an accompaniment of assurances that Washington is committed to the treaty. The large scale campaign of misinformation launched by the administration was designed to play a major role in the drive to bury SALT II. President Reagan had a lot to say about alleged violation of the treaty by the Soviet Union when he announced his decision.

He failed to produce any evidence to back up his allegations. One has the impression that the President knew he was distorting the facts when he spoke about the supposedly new Soviet SS-25 missiles. He probably knows that all other allegations brought against the Soviet Union have no leg to stand on too. President Reagan had no facts to support his claim. He hoped the American people would take his allegations at their face value.

President Reagan's speech about SALT II sounded like an ultimatum to the Soviet Union. The President lectured this country on what ways it should adopt to please Washington. His statement does not appear to be aimed at promoting Soviet-American cooperation and curbing the arms race. The Soviet Union believes that the statement of the American President is essentially aimed at burying SALT II. The present administration is the only American administration in recent decades that has failed to take any steps toward curbing the arms race. The United States' leaders apparently decided that this was not going far enough. They began dismantling what was done before them, having done absolutely nothing to bring the arms race to an end. Washington must realize that the Soviet Union is not going to give the Reagan administration a right to unilaterally determine which obligations assumed by it it can honor, and which it can drop.

The Soviet Union will draw appropriate conclusions from American moves, and undertake appropriate moves in response. The responsibility will rest squarely with those who have displayed a lack of political vision by raising a hand at the present system of international agreement serving to curb the nuclear arms race.

To 'Disinform Public'

PM141900 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "Deception Is Not Succeeding"]

[Text] Washington is mobilizing all the forces of the White House and State Department apparatus, the press, and the other news media. More and more new "arguments" are being invented with the aim of obscuring the true meaning of the decision made by the White House a few days ago regarding U.S. policy on the SALT II treaty. People are being assured in every way: Nothing dangerous is happening; on the contrary, Washington is actually taking a step in favor of peace and the preservation of Soviet-U.S. agreements. "The President has chosen arms control, not the tough line on which he 'rode' into the White House. Reagan has taken to his bosom a treaty that he repeatedly called 'disastrously wrong,'" THE WASHINGTON POST emotionally assures people, for instance.

However, the true situation is so self-evident that even those who have been told to add a little luster to the White House's unattractive stance keep on letting the cat out of the bag, effectively admitting that this is merely a blind designed to disinform public opinion, and, moreover, a blind that is the forced result of the circumstances in which Washington finds itself. Its course of cranking up the arms race in all directions and of removing all the obstacles that impede this is legitimately causing concern not only to the broad international public but also to ordinary Americans and the U.S. NATO allies.

Certain U.S. press organs are publicly admitting that the White House only wants to get a temporary respite in order to draw fire away from itself, place the blame on the other side, and confront the world with the fait accompli of the total transformation of the SALT II treaty into a "scrap of paper." It is inconvenient to state openly that Washington is reneging on the treaty:

After all, in that case all the peace-loving camouflage would vanish. The peoples' gaze is riveted on Geneva, where the new talks with the United States on nuclear and space armaments, talks that were suggested by the Soviet Union, are under way. Washington is certainly not planning to reach an effective agreement, however. On the other hand, people in the U.S. capital have no intention for even a minute of curtailing the implementation of the giant armament program. "The Pentagon," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes plainly, "has sufficient powers to plan more serious violations of the treaty: tests of the Midgetman missile as an addition to, rather than instead of, the MX, and also tests of exotic technology jeopardizing the most important of all agreements--the ABM Treaty."

The remarks of G. Will, an extreme right-wing newspaper commentator whose views are close to those of the White House, are typical. In an article in NEWSDAY he describes virtually as idiots those American advocates of continuing the arms limitation process who believed that Reagan "had joined their ranks and guaranteed the durability of SALT II." The President's ideas and views are "simply incompatible with compliance with SALT II," he admits.

For its part, THE WASHINGTON POST notes in an editorial: "Reagan told Defense Secretary Weinberger and other advocates of violating SALT II: 'Wait another 5 months, then you will be able to tell me about additional measures to build up armaments.'" Journalist D. Oberdorfer adds: Reagan's decision "was characterized in official statements as a temporary stance for a particular moment, and not for all time."

The White House press release circulated 10 June announces with the utmost clarity: "The Department of Defense will conduct a comprehensive assessment aimed at identifying specific actions which the United States could take to accelerate or augment as necessary [dlya neobkhodimogo uskoreniya ili dopolneniya] the U.S. strategic modernization program...."

The date when the Pentagon will submit the corresponding proposal has also been decided: November this year.

The true meaning of the White House's manipulations is becoming clear to world public opinion. Press organs that do not even adopt a disloyal position with regard to Washington are writing openly of this. Here are some of these remarks. "The U.S. President is clearly trying to reassure his West European allies" (Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS); "President Reagan's statement is chiefly aimed at lessening the concern felt by the West European NATO countries and Japan at the worsening prospects of reaching agreement at the Geneva talks" (Japan's MAINICHI); "Doubts remain. It is not clear from the U.S. Administration's statement whether it will adhere to the agreed procedure for destroying missiles exceeding the ceiling established by SALT II or will merely take a Poseidon submarine out of service but not destroy its missiles" (Britain's the GUARDIAN). No, the transatlantic missile worshipers are not succeeding in camouflaging their true intentions. It is becoming clear that Washington is merely seeking ways of gradually sliding out of the SALT II treaty.

18 July 1985

## Warnke Criticism Cited

LD151312 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, June 15 TASS--Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has stated it is no wonder that the Soviet side has regarded without enthusiasm President Reagan's statement on the U.S. policy with regard to SALT-2.

Speaking here at a conference of the Committee for National Security, he described as a false note the words contained in the President's statement about the "need" to seek progress within the framework of the talks in Geneva on nuclear arms while keeping silent on the talks on space armaments.

Mr Warnke recalled that the understanding that the two sides would seek the prevention of an arms race in outer space and an end to it on earth served as the basis for the start of the Geneva talks. He pointed out that an attempt at changing the formula of the talks is incompatible with progress at them. Mr Warnke criticized the administration-launched campaign of groundless accusations levelled at the Soviet Union as to "violations" of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty. He also pointed out the need to observe the 1972 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems of 1972. The Reagan administration is known to have taken a course towards undermining the treaty.

William Sexton, columnist of the paper NEWSDAY, writes that what the USA needs is the SALT-2 treaty, and not "star wars." The history of the arms race confirms that the arms race did not strengthen U.S. security a bit while compelling the Soviet Union to give an adequate reply to any U.S. step. Most specialists in the military field hold that "star wars" will have the same negative effect on U.S. security as the hydrogen bomb and MIRV's. The newspaper DAILY WORLD emphasizes that the Reagan administration's decision to observe on the whole the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty has no sense without U.S. practical steps in this field.

'Keeping Allies, Senate Quiet'

LD162344 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] Forums in Washington have been wondering once again how to deal with the problem and process of control over nuclear weapons.

As before, the issue was the fate of the treaty for the limitation of strategic weapons, SALT-II. It is well known that this treaty determines how many, and what sort of, nuclear weapon carriers may be held by the two nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. I would remind you that the treaty was signed in 1979 by U.S. President Carter, but was not ratified by the Senate. President Reagan has declared it dead on more than one occasion. No one can deny that the treaty is a long-suffering one, but it is tenacious, too. It

has turned out to be not quite so easy to bury it, because of resistance from the American public, from the United States' Western European allies, and because of the position of many in the U.S. Congress.

It was not easy to bury it, and as Reagan has come to understand, also unwise; he has decided to adapt it for his own ends, carrying out, supposedly within the framework of the treaty, modernization of the U.S. strategic forces. Yet, now the treaty's "shirt" has got a little tight for the new weapons which have grown up over the 4 and a bit years of the Reagan administration, during which the stupendous sum of \$1 trillion has been spent for military purposes.

Among the key clauses Washington was supposed to observe was the restriction on ballistic missiles with subprojectile or multiple warheads: 1,200 and no more of such missiles. However, in America the gigantic submarine Alaska, the seventh of the new Ohio-class submarines, and with 24 perfected multiple-warhead Trident missiles, will be operational by autumn. With this addition the set limit will be exceeded by 14 missiles--1,214 instead of 1,200.

In order not to violate the treaty it is necessary to dismantle one of the earlier Poseidon-class submarines with its 16 missiles. President Reagan was to report on his decision to Congress before 1 June, but he postponed it to 10 June since such bitter arguments flared up within his administration and throughout Washington's political circles. The superhawks, especially Weinberger, the secretary of defense, demanded that the SALT-II treaty be ditched without more ado, and that the Poseidon submarine remain, with its missiles, among the submarines in service. The moderates, grouping themselves around Secretary of State Shultz, understand that such a provocative course would have a fatal effect on the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva: The Reagan administration would stand before the entire world as an open opponent weapons control, and it would aggravate U.S. relations with the NATO allies who are already alarmed by the new U.S. militarist plans.

We do not have time to give you the details of the upheavals in the latest internal political juggling in Washington, but in short, President Reagan decided after all to dismantle the Poseidon submarine we mentioned. At the same time, he made arrangements to continue increasing the U.S. strategic forces and announced that he would make a final decision on a course of action later, examining each case on an individual basis, in the light of the Russians' actions.

The Soviet appraisal of the President's decision has been given in a special TASS statement in which it is said that the United States has embarked on the road of constantly worming its way out of the treaty, of throwing away, one after the other, the very restrictions it had stipulated. Furthermore, the U.S. decision is qualified thus: No one should be under any illusion that the U.S. side will be allowed to determine arbitrarily which obligations will be observed and which will not, the TASS statement says; to expect that the other side will play along with such a line on the part of the United States is a dangerous illusion.

As far as the reaction to the President's decision in America is concerned, liberal observers speak about the defeat of hawks like Weinberger and are glad that a chance for the negotiations in Geneva has been preserved.

However, the conservative observer George Will writes that they, that is his liberal colleagues, underestimate Reagan's cunning. Reagan is sacrificing one submarine for the sake of keeping the allies and the Senate quiet, Will writes. These allies and the Senate will find it more difficult to act when he takes his next step against SALT-II.

#### Continuing Anti-SALT Campaign Seen

LD152143 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 15 Jun 85

[Text] Washington has made quite a few statements on its attitude towards the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II. Here is a commentary by Spartak Beglov of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY.

The administration has said that it is going to honor the provisions of the treaty. Its moves point in the opposite direction, however. Take the Star Wars project, for instance. The development of that space weapons system violates Article 5 of SALT II. Six years ago, on 18th June, 1979, I was in Vienna as the two countries were signing the treaty. However, powerful circles in the United States already then tried to undermine the treaty.

Ten weeks after the Vienna ceremony I arrived in the United States, at the height of the campaign about the alleged Soviet military presence in Cuba. The Americans were not inclined to believe that story. My American colleagues from local newspapers told me bluntly that the hawks were in a flutter to cast doubts on SALT II and Cuba and nothing to do with the campaign. The United States has never ratified the treaty as a result.

The most striking thing about the official announcements concerning SALT II made by the White House recently is the instruction to Defense Secretary Weinberger that he should submit a report to the Administration in 5 months' time on the proposed line of action by the United States in response to what was termed Soviet violations of SALT II. Since there have been no Soviet violations of the treaty this can only mean that the Administration is hoping to bury SALT II before the end of the year. President Reagan's pledge of readiness to walk another mile to induce the Russians to take positive action can only arouse irony because Washington is in fact moving very fast in the opposite direction to further rev up the arms race.

#### U.S. Violations, Diktat

PM181123 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Jun 85 p 9

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Observer's Opinion": "How Well Different People Sleep at Night"]

[Text] Lieutenant General John Chain, director of the U.S. State Department Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, is upset. Speaking at the Washington diplomatic observers' club, he was grief-stricken. "I am disappointed in the Soviet Union's reaction to the President's decision on the SALT II treaty. From my point of view it was an excellent decision."

Without being acquainted with Gen Chain, I am, however, sure he was aware that he was being shamelessly hypocritical. But perhaps the general justified himself by the fact that, first, duty is duty, and, second, people higher up are even more hypocritical.

The "excellent decision" on SALT II, announced by U.S. President Reagan 10 June, is a big lie which in fact brings together several deceptions at once. It is a long, complicated story, but if we keep to the facts rather than the propagandist fabrications, it boils down to the following.

Six years ago, in 1979, the USSR and the United States signed the second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty--SALT II. Its elaboration was so difficult and prolonged that several American Administrations took part in preparing SALT II. It is not difficult to guess that they were involved in this task not because they were "working for" the Soviet Union but were concerned about only one thing, how to ensure its security. A treaty reflecting a serious, highly important aspect of reality in our time--military parity between the USSR and the United States--seemed to them to be expedient, advantageous, and necessary to the United States, to the same extent that all people on earth today, including the vast majority of Americans, regard as expedient, advantageous, and necessary the task of at least suppressing the nuclear genie and, preferably, putting it back in the bottle. On the American side, just as on the Soviet side, top military authorities took part in the treaty's elaboration--people who knew how to do the difficult, not to say excruciating work of comparing the two sides' military potential and establishing specific and, of course, equal limitations on its further growth.

For us, and for the rest of the world too, it was more than an unpleasant surprise that pinheaded, parish-pump politicking led to the treaty not being ratified in the United States. It was some consolation, though not much, that the Washington authorities agreed to abide by the main provisions of the unratified SALT II. Again, they did not do this out of love for our country or a great love of peace; they were worried about their own security and realized that politicking is all very well, but the threat which hangs over everyone is coming closer and becoming more real every day.

The recent TASS statement cites irrefutable and unrefuted facts showing how the Washington authorities set about violating the treaty step by step--from refusing to observe the protocol to SALT II, which is an integral part of it, which gave the green light for the appearance of long-range cruise missiles, which is nothing less than a new class of strategic arms, to the deployment of new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe, which, it was supposed, will give the United States the opportunity to secure military superiority.

R. Reagan's administration did not simply move toward the elimination of the treaty system limiting the nuclear arms race, but began to act in a frankly headlong manner in this direction. We will not now enumerate all the military programs directly contrary to the SALT II treaty which have been launched at full speed; much has already been said about this. The apotheosis of bellicose hegemonism and claims to impose their own diktat on the rest of the world is the "star wars" plans. They contradicted in the most direct form not only SALT II, but common sense and the logic of life and mankind's survival as he faces a choice on the threshold of the 21st century: either stop the further arms buildup or consent to the threat of universal destruction.

It is hard to imagine that the present Washington leaders do not know about this tough choice, but they have gotten carried away, thinking that by force, including the use of force from space, they will be able to impose their own system, their own unshakable domination, on mankind. They considered it necessary to provide propaganda cover for this military madness. They made an unimaginable noise to prove that the Soviet Union is supposedly violating SALT II, so that the United States has no other option than to refuse to observe this treaty.

This looked like such a crude lie, such an absurdity, that it embarrassed many people even in the U.S. ruling circles. Then the U.S. authorities thought up a very "cunning" move. On 10 June R. Reagan announced: OK, the United States will adhere to SALT II for another 5 months, but unless in that time the Soviet Union demonstrates that it is not violating the treaty and makes concessions at the Geneva talks, the Washington authorities will consider their hands completely free. That was downright diktat under cover of an enormous lie.

The highly experienced, wise observer John Chancellor of American's NBC television stated on this subject: "If someone less sure of himself were in Ronald Reagan's place, he would not sleep at night because of the problems over the SALT II treaty, which limits the U.S. and USSR nuclear arsenals and which expires this year."

As far as we know, the U.S. President has no problem sleeping. Millions of Americans cannot sleep, however. Understandably.

'Cover Up True Intentions'

PM181526 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Attack on Treaty"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Jun--The U.S. Administration has not given up the idea of killing off the SALT II treaty in order to give itself an entirely free hand for further cranking up the arms race. This is the conclusion of a WASHINGTON POST article analyzing the distribution of forces in the administration regarding the agreement.

According to the aforesaid information there is no influential member of the U.S. leadership who would favor firm observance of the treaty commitments. A particularly fierce attack on the treaty is being conducted by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, his deputy F. Ikle, and assistant R. Perle. They are vigorously supported by U.S. Attorney General E. Meese, representing the "legal basis" for rejecting the treaty, and CIA Director W. Casey. They are also actively supported by K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He, the newspaper notes, not only opposes the establishment of arms control but also criticizes all existing agreements in this sphere.

However, the administration has to cover up its true intentions since it has been forced to take account of feelings in the United States itself and among U.S. allies in NATO and worldwide. As an example, the newspaper cites in par-

ticularly the adoption by the Senate of a resolution calling on the administration to observe the provisions of SALT II and the stance assumed by the U.S. NATO allies. The latter, as the influential U.S. weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT attests, are so alarmed at Washington's negative attitude to SALT II that U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, during his stay in Portugal at the session of the NATO Council at foreign minister level, had to cable Reagan about it three times.

Currently, the White House and the Pentagon are continuing to try to fully implement the program for the creation and deployment of MX strategic nuclear missiles. In an ABC TV interview C. Weinberger stated that Congress must review its decision and sanction the funds requested by the administration for building 100 MX missiles. He hinted that the restoration of the MX program to its former scale would be just one of a whole series of "recommendations" for building up U.S. strategic potential, which the Pentagon is to present to Reagan by this November. As an administration spokesman pointed out, the presentation of the new report for presidential examination is timed to coincide with the start of the fiscal 1987 "budget cycle," when the administration will launch its latest campaign to wheedle out of Congress the funds for accelerating the arms race.

#### Pershing II's Considered

LD182013 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Six years ago, on 18 June 1979, the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic arms was signed in Vienna. Over to Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer:

I had the opportunity of visiting the Austrian capital during those days in June. I recall the satisfaction with which journalists from all over the world assembled in the press center at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna and received the news that the treaty had been signed. True, I cannot help recalling that some of my American colleagues warned against excessive optimism.

They pointed to reports which had already begun to appear at that time concerning Pentagon orders for new nuclear missiles. The name of these missiles--Pershings--appeared in the U.S. press for the first time in those days. American observers, commenting on these reports, emphasized that since orders for these missiles had already been placed, it would be difficult to withdraw them: U.S. firms would show no inclination to give up profitable orders even if the already signed treaty had to be torn to shreds.

Unfortunately, life showed how right they were. The production of Pershings and their deployment in Western Europe continued. There they became strategic arms for the United States. As for the SALT II treaty, it remained unratified by the U.S. Senate, since an influential lobby representing the interests of military concerns has always existed and continues to exist in the Senate.

Following the replacement of the Carter government by the Reagan administration, known for its particularly close ties with the leading California concerns

specializing in military business and, above all, in aerospace business, the influence that military monopolies had in Washington grew even more. Suffice it to say that during the first 4 years of Reagan's presidency, U.S. military spending reached a record level, going over the trillion dollar mark. The SALT treaty became a stumbling block for the military concerns. It is after that, in particular, that Washington began to steer a course aimed at commencing a new round of the arms race, but this time it was the space arms race.

However, broad circles of the world public, including the U.S. public itself, began and continue to demand, with ever greater insistence, that the treaty should be observed, regarding it as an obstacle along the path that leads to the unleashing of an even more frenzied arms race.

As a result, by the sixth anniversary of the treaty, Washington is in a situation which THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR characterized as follows: President Reagan would be happy to kill the treaty, but he cannot afford to do so. So now Washington has embarked upon a path of gradually crawling out of the treaty, throwing out the restrictions provided for in the treaty one by one.

However, the Soviet Union has warned that it will draw appropriate conclusions from all this, conclusions dictated by the interests of its security and the security of its allies.

CSO: 5200/1258

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW VIEWS U.S. SINCERITY ON SALT II ANNIVERSARY

LD172155 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Commentary by Victor Levin]

[Text] *Pacta sunt servanda* -- treaties should be observed. This is one of the founding, age-old principles of international law. However, one has to recall this even today, for the advocates of the theory that treaties are scraps of paper that can at any time be thrown aside have by no means died out. Precisely this position is adopted by the present administration and precisely such is its approach to the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons signed 6 years ago on 17 June 1979.

The anniversary of the signing of the SALT-II treaty gives ground to recall what aims were set by the sides which signed it, and analyze what has given both to the Soviet Union and the United States, and indeed the world as a whole. The entry into force of this treaty, the Soviet Union considered, opened up the opportunity to begin the elaboration of subsequent measures not only on the limitation but also the reduction of strategic weapons. A large step forward on the path of the general improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, and this means the whole international climate, was made by the conclusion of the SALT-II treaty.

A similar opinion was also expressed at the time by the U.S. President. He noted that the SALT-II treaty was founded on the real needs for security by our two countries, and allows both sides to move in the direction of safeguarding a more secure world with even more considerable limitations and reductions within the framework of SALT III.

A high appraisal of the treaty signed 6 years ago was also given by broad circles of the international public. It was assessed as an important landmark on the path of limiting the arms race and of eliminating the threat of nuclear war. However, a shadow from Washington, which refused to ratify the treaty, very soon fell on the treaty. Today it is necessary to remind people of this, since in the U.S. capital they are trying to present themselves in the role of enthusiastic supporters of the treaty, which is being subjected to undermining from the USSR, as they allege there without adducing any proofs.

This is being done not in the name of strengthening the obligations of the treaty to which the sides decided to adhere, but in the search of a pretext for abandoning them, for rupturing the SALT-II treaty. The matter has gone as far as President Reagan openly posing the question of the U.S. intention to throw aside the treaty as a useless piece of paper and unleash a new stage of building up strategic weapons in order to exceed all the limits established 6 years ago. This question remains with us.

The Soviet Union is still true to obligations, true to the spirit and the letter of the SALT-II treaty. We are prepared to go further, too, on the path of cardinal reduction of existing nuclear weapons and on the path of not permitting the militarization of space. The USSR is strictly and rigorously carrying out the SALT-II treaty.

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON U.S. PLANS FOR MX MISSILE

House Votes Cuts

LD190644 Moscow TASS in English 0620 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 19 TASS -- The House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress voted substantial cuts in the programme for the development and deployment of MX strategic first-strike nuclear missiles.

The amendment approved by the congressmen envisions the deployment of 40 MX missiles instead of 100, as was initially planned by the White House and the Pentagon. Under the amendment, UPI reports, no missiles will be built in fiscal 1986. However, reflecting the ambiguity of its position, the House rejected an amendment envisioning the abrogation of the MX programme.

Meanwhile, President Reagan stated yesterday that the MX missile was needed by the United States. Addressing a press conference at the White House, he urged the continuation of the strategic modernisation programme aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. The development and deployment of MX missiles, each carrying 10 nuclear warheads, is a major component of the modernisation programme.

Perle Statement Cited

LD191701 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 19 TASS -- Speaking to journalists, U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle said the Pentagon planned to install MX intercontinental ballistic missiles in hardened silos where they would be protected by a missile defense system. Commenting on the statement, UPI news agency said the deployment of such a system on a large scale would violate the 1972 ABM Treaty.

New York June 19 TASS -- THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR said it was only American public opinion and the U.S. allies in NATO pressing for arms control talks with the Soviet Union and for compliance with the existing agreements in the field that were keeping the U.S. Administration from scrapping the SALT-2 treaty. The paper recalled that Reagan opposed the treaty even as far back as his 1980 campaign.

CSO: 5200/1260

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS SEES EVIDENCE OF U.S. FIRST-STRIKE PREPARATIONS

LD162031 Moscow TASS in English 1859 GMT 16 Jun 85

[TASS headline: "Counting on First-Strike Weapons"]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS--TASS news analyst Vasily Kharkov writes:

The third anniversary of the Soviet Union's solemn pledge that it unilaterally undertakes not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is marked on these June days. The USSR urged the other nuclear powers to assume a similar obligation. That was a truly historic act which is of immense international importance. Grateful mankind will always remember this major initiative which reflects the Soviet Union's principled peaceful course. Should the USA and its allies possessing nuclear weapons assume such an obligation, the situation in the world would become different, much more stable, and the international security would become much stronger. But Washington did not heed the call and, as facts show, has diametrically opposite goals, intensively preparing for the delivery of a first nuclear strike. Another evidence of that is provided by an article published in today's Sunday supplement to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST.

The article says that high-ranking spokesmen of the Pentagon admit that new weapons systems which are being added to the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal, such as the MX intercontinental ballistic missiles and the submarine-launched Trident missile, are specially designed to enable the USA to deliver a preemptive strike against the Soviet Union. The article points out that one of Pentagon generals has stated that if a nuclear war breaks out, it would be started by the United States.

As is seen, the build-up of first-strike nuclear capability with an eye to impunity underlies the U.S. military-strategic plans. And since the SALT-II treaty does not fit into those plans, Washington seeks to crawl out of it, discarding one treaty-provided limit after another.

Washington does not even think of any limitation on the nuclear arms race. Assertions which are being spread that the President's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) is a non-nuclear programme turn out in actual fact to be neither more nor less than enticing publicity. The paper NEWSDAY on Saturday [15 June] carried a report on Secret Directive 172 which was issued on May 30, this year, by the National Security Council. The directive said that nuclear weapons should become one of the elements of the programme. So, Washington has taught an object-lesson to those who still entertained some illusions about the true purpose of the SDI.

The present U.S. Administration over the four years of its stay in office has spent more than 1,007,000 million dollars for military purposes, shattering all records. Expenditures on nuclear weapons rose in a particularly rapid way. They have trebled since 1980. All this indicates that Washington does not even think of abandoning the path of the deadly race of nuclear arms. On the contrary, it intends to spiral it up still more.

CSO: 5200/1260

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS HITS ROWNY STATEMENT IN ICBM CUTS PROPOSAL

LD101952 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow, 10 Jun (TASS) -- TASS military observer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

An extremely "tough" position is being adhered to in official Washington: Only whatever is to the liking of the present administration is good and in order. No agreement counts if it is not in its interests. Thus, for example, the USSR and the United States agreed in Geneva to observe the confidentiality of talks on nuclear and space weapons. But what is this confidentiality for? Just how will Washington publicize its alleged striving for "nuclear weapons reduction" and distract the public's attention from its total unwillingness to prevent the militarization of space? But of course, through unrestrained publicizing of the allegedly "constructive" American position. Thus the United States is indeed "setting out" its position, but is doing it in such a way that ill-informed people would not understand what Washington is striving for.

Take the recent statement by E. Rowny, special consultant of the U.S. President and secretary of state, on the subject of the Geneva talks. "The United States continues to propose that both sides reduce the warheads of their missiles to an equal number from 7,500 each to 5,000." Outwardly this sounds attractive. The reductions are substantial. However, a question arises: Why are only ballistic missiles singled out from the entire sum total of strategic means as the basis for reductions? The answer is always the same: because this is advantageous only for Washington.

Indeed the strategic armaments of the USSR and the United States are not identical in their structure. They have developed in different directions, although the strategic potentials of the sides are balanced. In the Soviet Union there has traditionally been greatest development of land-based ICBMs, whilst in the United States sea-based ballistic missiles and strategic aviation have experienced the greatest development. In the USSR around 70 percent of the warheads belong to ground-based ICBMs, whilst in the United States the figure is around 20 percent. But then more than 80 percent of warheads are deployed on their submarine ballistic missiles and heavy bombers.

The explanation for the U.S. proposal is very simple to discover: Using the differences in the structure of the strategic forces of the sides, it is proposed to carry out reductions such as would basically affect Soviet missiles. The U.S. weapons would be affected to an incomparably lesser extent.

Even the figure itself -- 5,000 warheads -- will not "fully" characterize the U.S. strategic nuclear potential. Mr Rowny omits some "small details." Elementary calculations done according to the American scheme show that to these 5,000 warheads must be added 8,000 nuclear charges of cruise missiles deployed on 400 American heavy bombers (the U.S. representatives themselves have spoken of this). The total comes to 13,000 menacing warheads. Then if one takes into account the U.S. desire to give itself the green light for an uncontrolled build-up of long-range land-based and sea-based cruise missiles, and also other nuclear arms on heavy bombers (SRAM missiles, aerial bombs, etc.) which are not limited at all, then as a result the total number of nuclear charges which would be permitted, according to the American approach, on strategic carriers, could reach 15,000 units or more. That's "deep cuts" for you!

What is offered to the Soviet Union in this case? That it should substantially reduce the warheads on its ICBM's and a large proportion of its missiles, and, in order to re-establish parity with the United States, to build, in addition to the 150 strategic bombers currently in the USSR, a very large number of new airplanes, in order to match the United States, which already has almost 600 strategic bombers, in this form of strategic armament? So where is the observance of the principle of equality and equal security of the sides here?

It is not hard to draw a simple conclusion from all this: The United States is hoping to obtain a strategic arms limitation agreement that would lead to unilateral advantages for the United States and harm the defense capability of the USSR and all the countries of the socialist community.

The deployment of an arms race in space and its unbridled continuation on earth is what lies behind the publicity given to the U.S. position at the talks. It is precisely this unrealistic position that so far has prevented any progress from being achieved at Geneva.

CSO: 5200/1243

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW SURVEYS SOVIET PROPOSALS SINCE SALT II

LD111414 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 11 Jun 85

[Text] On 18 June it will be 6 years since the Soviet Union and the United States concluded a treaty in Vienna on limiting strategic offensive weapons which has generally become known as SALT II. Here is what Radio Moscow Commentator Aleksandr Pogodin writes:

First, let's recall what that weighty and detailed document is about. Under the SALT II Treaty, the Soviet Union and the United States pledged to limit the number of strategic weapons, that includes intercontinental missiles stationed on land, missile launchers on submarines and bombers, equipped for cruise missiles and air-to-surface missiles and certain other types of weapons.

The two sides agreed that each pledges to limit strategic weapons at once, to a total number which doesn't exceed 2,400 units. And starting with January 1981, 2,250 units. Within that total number there should not be more than 1,200 missiles equipped with multiple individually targeted warheads. Also of principal importance was the commitment by the Soviet Union and the United States not to develop, test or deploy vehicles for putting nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction into low orbits. When signing the treaty the two sides said that it presented a mutually acceptable balance of interests of the Soviet Union and the United States, based on the principle of equality and equal security. It was also a substantial contribution to preventing a nuclear war and thus it was in the interests of not only the Soviet and American people but in the interests of all peace-loving mankind.

The Soviet Union has been, and continues to constantly and scrupulously comply with all the provisions of the SALT II Treaty, which is still a certain threshold holding back the escalation of rivalry in strategic arms and in that way helps to preserve international stability.

In accordance with the joint statement of the two sides on the need for further measures to limit strategic arms which was made when the treaty was signed, the Soviet Union has advanced a number of practical initiatives in the field. For instance, at the talks on nuclear and space arms now being held in Geneva the Soviet Union proposed a complete ban on strike-space weapons and the radical reduction of strategic arms and at the same time to renounce the

program of developing and deploying new strategic weapons, or to strictly limit those programs. A radical reduction would apply to both the strategic delivery vehicles and the total number of nuclear warheads on them. The Soviet side also proposed to mutually renounce such a new and dangerous type of strategic offensive weapon as long-range cruise missiles, no matter what type of base they have.

CSO: 5200/1260

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS REPORTS AUSTRALIAN BACKING FOR SALT II COMPLIANCE

LD071940 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 7 Jun 85

[Text] Paris June 7 TASS--The Australian Government expresses firm conviction of the need to further observe the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments (SALT-2) between the USSR and the United States. Speaking in Canberra, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia Robert Hawke stressed that this treaty should be abided by until new accords are reached at Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, a FRANCE PRESSE correspondent reports. The Australian Government, said the prime minister, considers it essential that the policy be pursued, which would not erode the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty.

Australia is of the opinion that the Soviet Union is committed to the basic provisions of the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaty. Our country, said the prime minister, believes that the USSR does not plan any steps which could seriously upset the strategic parity or give unilateral advantage in the field of strategic armament.

CSO: 5200/1259

SALT/START ISSUES

FINLAND'S LEADING PAPER APPLAUDS U.S. FOR HOLDING SALT LIMITS

Helsinki HELSINKIN SANOMAT in Finnish 13 Jun 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Reagan Brought Breathing Spell to Nuclear Arms Race"]

[Text] New possibilities for the negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons have clearly opened up now that United States President Ronald Reagan will continue to comply with the unratified SALT II agreement until the middle of next year. The agreement was to expire at the end of this year, and afterwards the superpowers' nuclear arms race would have been curbed only by the 1972 agreement to restrict antiballistic missiles.

Presidents Jimmy Carter and Leonid Brezhnev signed the SALT II agreement in 1979, but Carter did not get Congress to approve it. In the 1980 presidential election campaign, Reagan characterized the agreement as tragically inadequate and in its place called for distinct reductions in missile stockpiles. In his view, an agreement like SALT which permits small increases in missiles is worthy only of rejection.

Reagan's change of mind is also emphatically clear, because on Monday he was forced to take sides with one of his two closest cabinet members. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had firmly urged the President to discard the entire agreement and to place confidence in rearmament. According to Weinberger's public speeches, Reagan will lose all his credibility in the eyes of Soviet leaders if he now gives his continued support to an agreement which is not ratified and which he himself has unambiguously condemned. Nevertheless, the President endorsed the standpoint of Secretary of State George Shultz, who speaks on behalf of indispensable cooperation between the superpowers.

In the cooperation policy of Shultz and national security adviser Robert McFarlane, there are echoes of the decade-old line of thought of Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, who were inclined to accept global interdependence as a starting point.

Reagan's adherence to SALT II deserves recognition. The radical decision also meant the President's dissociation from his most loyal group of ultraconservative supporters, who reject all negotiations and agreements on arms limitations. Then again, the European allied countries, in which the superpowers' nuclear arms race is continuously experienced as a burdensome problem, have also pleaded for a change of mind.

The questions now focus on the firmness and authenticity of the President's decision. The Soviet Union has already expressed its misgivings, and many supporters of Star Wars may also assume that compliance with the SALT II agreement, which sets limits on offensive missiles, serves to promote the credibility of Star Wars. After all, the alternative to compliance with SALT is an uncontrollable race to construct offensive missiles. The Americans assume that without SALT the Soviet Union would increase the number of its strategic nuclear warheads from 9,000 to roughly 30,000 by the year 1995. Such an arsenal would no longer leave the Star Wars space defense with any kind of credibility in the minds of even the most ardent supporters.

Reagan's motives may thus be of the ulterior kind, but they can also be interpreted as sincere in the sense that by adhering to SALT he really reduces the potential number of nuclear weapons in the world of tomorrow.

On the missile front, the approximate balance thus continues at the present level without the need to seek a much higher level at great expense. The situation on the negotiating front is delicate and sensitive. Once more, the Soviet Union could now be expected to offer a considerable cutback in missile stockpiles, about which it has already made tentative proposals on several occasions.

12327  
CSO: 5200/2658

SALT/START ISSUES

CHINESE MEDIA VIEWS CONTROVERSY OVER SALT II

HK150750 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 14 Jun 85 p 7

[*"News Analysis"* by Zhang Dezhen: "The Controversy Over the Continuation or Abolition of SALT"]

[Text] On 10 June, U.S. President Ronald Reagan formally declared that the United States will continue to abide by the Soviet-U.S. SALT II Treaty, but demanded that the Soviet Union "correct" their noncompliance. He declared that the United States will reserve "the right to respond at an appropriate time" to any Soviet violations of the treaty. This announcement has temporarily calmed the recent debate in the United States on the continuation or abolition of the treaty.

The second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was jointly signed by former Soviet and U.S. leaders on 18 June 1979 in Vienna. As a result of the deterioration of Soviet-U.S. relations due to the situation in Afghanistan, the accord was never ratified by the U.S. Congress. However, both the United States and the Soviet Union expressed willingness to abide by the stipulations of this treaty. However, since the treaty was signed, neither of the two signatories has actually kept its promise. Instead, both have tried by every means to take advantage of the loopholes to seek military superiority and have repeatedly violated the provisions of the treaty. The two superpowers were recently engaged in a fierce verbal battle by reproaching each other for violating the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

The United States charged that the Soviet Union had recently begun to develop another new weapon -- the SS-X-25 missile -- after the development of the SS-X-24 missile, and took measures to conceal the tests and interfere with examination by the United States, thus violating the SALT II provision that neither side can produce or deploy more than one type of new strategic missiles.

Meanwhile, the United States also charged that the Soviet Union possessed 2,250 pieces of strategic arms vehicles, or some 600 pieces more than the ceiling specified by the treaty. To give the United States tit for tat, the Soviet Union charged that the United States "had repeated and rudely violated" the provisions of SALT II by having the number of its multi-warhead missiles exceed the limit specified by the treaty, building too many land-based missile launch facilities, and stepping up the deployment of sea-based long-range cruise missiles. In short, both the United States and the Soviet Union have tried hard to profess to abide by the treaty and lay blame on the other side for violating the treaty.

At present, the Reagan administration is faced with the question of whether to continue to observe this treaty or let it become invalid after SALT II reaches maturity at the end of this year. A more pressing question to be solved is that as a new Trident nuclear submarine will be shaken down next September, Washington must decide whether to demolish the missile equipment on an old submarine so as to keep the number of missiles within the limits specified by SALT II.

There have always been two sharply differing opinions on the above questions within the Reagan administration. Some people represented by the Pentagon hold that since the Soviet Union has continually violated the treaty, "the United States should take corresponding actions and need not restrain itself;" otherwise it will "be involved in a stupid policy of appeasement in strategic matters." But other people represented by the State Department hold that the termination of this treaty "will give rise to an unbridled arms race: that will seriously affect the Geneva disarmament talks and U.S.-Soviet relations as a whole. On 5 June, the United States Senate adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution demanding that the Reagan administration continue to abide by SALT II until the end of 1986. Meanwhile, at the NATO foreign ministers meeting in early June, West European countries asked the United States not to abruptly abolish SALT II. Under the pressure of public opinion at home and abroad, and after careful consideration by weighing advantages and disadvantages, President Reagan finally decided to continue to abide by the treaty.

Of course, Reagan's decision is conditional. In his own words, if the United States discovers further Soviet violations of the treaty, it will "reserve" the right to respond "appropriately and correspondingly." In addition, Reagan also ordered the Department of Defense to submit a report on Soviet armaments and its implementation of SALT II before 15 November so that the President can make a final decision on whether to abide by SALT II based on the report. American newspapers said that this means that the President "still reserves room for maneuvering."

SALT II was signed 6 years ago, and facts over the past 6 years show that the arms race between the superpowers will never be restrained by an agreement which may be a mere scrap of paper. Conversely, the treaty, which merely limits the quantity of nuclear weapons and places no limits on the quality of nuclear weapons, will in fact prompt the superpowers to develop more advanced and more sophisticated new weapons so as to speed up the upgrading of their armaments.

CSO: 5200/4046

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

STANDING CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION AGREEMENT--Geneva June 14 TASS--The Soviet-American Standing Consultative Commission, which has been set up to facilitate the implementation of the aims and provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed by the USSR and the United States on May 26, 1972, and the Agreement on Measures To Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War, signed by the two countries on September 30, 1971, ended another session here today. In the context of these common aims the sides signed during the session a common understanding aimed at further enhancing the viability of the ABM Treaty and a common understanding concerning the use of immediate notifications in connection with the agreement on measures to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war between the USSR and the United States. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 14 Jun 85]

TASS REPORTS MINUTEMAN TEST--New York June 17 TASS--On Sunday, the United States conducted new trials of the intercontinental ballistic missile Minuteman-3 capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The UPI news agency quotes a spokesman for the U.S. Air Force as saying that two missiles were launched from the Vandenberg Air Force Base (California) into the area of Kwajalein atoll, which is part of the Marshall Islands in Micronesia. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 17 Jun 85]

TASS ON B-1 BOMBER OPERATION--Washington, 18 Jun (TASS)--The first new-generation B-1 strategic bomber will go into operation several months earlier than planned, at the end of June this year, the Pentagon has reported. Training flights on this bomber, which will be deployed at Dyess Air Force Base in Texas, will start in mid-July. The deployment of the B-1 bombers is one of the key elements in the program of strategic nuclear modernization being carried out by the United States. Within the framework of this program, aimed at achieving military superiority, it is planned to build and deploy 100 such bombers, costing a total of \$20.5 billion. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0259 GMT 18 Jun 85]

TASS ON PACIFIC ROCKET LAUNCHES--Moscow June 18 TASS--Launchings of booster rockets will be carried out in the Soviet Union over the period from June 21 to 30, 1985 into an area of the Pacific within a radius of 50 nautical miles with a centre at 24 degrees 33 minutes latitude north and 168 degrees 54 minutes longitude east. TASS is authorized to state that to ensure safety the USSR Government requests the governments of other states using the sea and air lanes in the Pacific to instruct the bodies concerned so that sea-going ships and planes do not enter that area and airspace over it daily from 7.00 a.m. to 11.00 a.m. of the local time.

CSO: 5200/1268

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR 'FORCED' TO RESPOND TO U.S. SLCM DEPLOYMENT

LD182349 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has published another annual report which, among other things, considers factors that destabilize the international situation. Here is a commentary contribution by Viktor Olin:

One such factor named in the report is the sea-launched cruise missile, one of the latest types of nuclear weapons. The report says that the arrival of the missiles last year led to more difficulties in controlling arms and increasing the risk of a nuclear war. Commenting on the report, the director of the institute, Frank (?Blackby), named the reasons why sea-launched cruise missiles are so destabilizing: Sea-launched cruise missiles are deployed at advance combat stations and they can suddenly attack their targets.

The arrival of the missiles has considerably increased the number of launch platforms, and since the missiles are very accurate, the temptation to use them in a first nuclear strike may very well be too strong. The decision to launch such missiles is within the competence of the chief commanding officer on the ship where they are deployed, and that greatly increases the risk of a nuclear war breaking out as a result of an accident or a human error. The report of the Stockholm Peace Research Institute says that by the year 2000 the United States will have deployed over 2,500 platforms for launching missiles from surface ships and submarines.

The report confirms that the Soviet Union was forced to take measures in response to the added threat to its security posed by American sea-launched cruise missiles. The USSR took those measures after the United States had begun deploying them.

The pattern characteristic for the entire postwar period was repeated once again as this country had to catch up with the United States and neutralize Washington's moves aimed at acquiring military strategic superiority. That process began back in 1946 when the United States interfered with the adoption by the United Nations of the Soviet proposal for an international convention banning the production and use of nuclear weapons forever.

The United States rejected that proposal because it hoped that its nuclear monopoly will remain there for good. As a result the Soviet Union was forced to develop nuclear weapons of its own, which it did, in the late 40's. There are over 50 million nuclear warheads in the world today and that number keeps growing.

The United States has always been the one that initiated the manufacture and deployment of the most advanced and destabilizing types of weapons, forcing the Soviet Union to take action in response. The same pattern was followed in the case of strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles, independently targetted warheads, submarines with nuclear missiles on board, and other weapons. The deployment of sea-launched cruise missiles merely confirms the trend. That trend can only be reversed if resolute action is taken to freeze the nuclear arsenals and renounce the development of the most sophisticated weapons, including weapons in space, as the Soviet Union has been proposing all the time.

CSO: 5200/1267

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S. 'BRAINWASHING' DUTCH MP'S INTO ACCEPTING MISSILES

LD080357 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 8 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 8 TASS--TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports: The Reagan administration is busily wooing Dutch parliamentarians in a bid to win the Hague's support for plans to deploy American nuclear-tipped cruise missiles in the territory of the Netherlands.

In keeping with a procedure set by the Dutch Parliament, the final decision on whether to agree to the missiles' installment there or not will be taken next November. In the meantime, it has been learnt, Dutch MPS are being invited to the United States and given special "interviews" aimed at "brainwashing" and hard-pressing them into accepting the ideas of the missiles deployments in the territory of their country.

One group of Dutch MPS is now completing such a visit to the United States, which the American side has taken care to let the press know practically nothing about. But it still has become known that the "interviews" with the parliamentarians have been mostly conducted by representatives of different American intelligence services, whose task has been, judging from an ASSOCIATED PRESS report, to give the Dutch MPS a scare with gibberish allegations about a "nuclear threat" to their country, which is ostensibly flowing from the Soviet Union, and thereby to convince them of the "need" to have American ground-based cruise missiles sited in the Netherlands as a kind of counter-balance.

CSO: 5200/1267

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH PAPER VIEWS SOVIET SS-20 MORATORIUM

PM121224 Rotterdam NRC Handelsblad in Dutch 4 Jun 85 p 9

[Editorial: "Long Live Logic"]

[Text] In a PRAVDA interview at the beginning of April Soviet leader Gorbachev announced a unilateral halt to the deployment of SS-20's in the European section of the Soviet Union until 1 November 1985. For the Netherlands this date was most interesting for it is then that the Lubbers cabinet will reach its decision about the deployment of 48 cruise missiles at Woensdrecht. It will do so on the basis of the criterion whether there are deployed in the whole of the Soviet Union more than the 378 SS-20 systems which NATO counted on 1 June 1984, or whether Washington and Moscow have reached their arms control agreement on such systems. The Netherlands decision is viewed, not wholly unjustly, as a national and somewhat belated variant of the December 1979 two-track decision.

NATO reaction, and thus that of the Netherlands, to the unilateral Gorbachev move was negative, because the deployed (or still to be deployed) ss-20's in the Asian section of the Soviet Union were not covered by the freeze.

But, just look, a mere 2 months later United States and Canada Institute Deputy Director Bogdanov in an interview with this newspaper (yesterday) declares that his country has not deployed any more SS-20's in the European part of the Soviet Union since November 1983. Is it likely that Gorbachev did not know that when he was interviewed by PRAVDA last April and announced his unilateral move as something new? Or is it the case that the coordination in the Russian capital is not as good as it could be when it comes to exerting influence on the little NATO nation on the North Sea with its peculiar cruise missile decision?

We favor the latter assumption and note that Soviet interest in the Dutch political debate about the counting of SS-20's has obviously increased but has still not reached the highest level of the formulation of political policy or logic. The fact that this is the case is a cause for sadness, given the bilateral aspirations of the Netherlands cruise missile decision.

CSO: 5200/2671

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADIAN SUPREME COURT DISMISSES ANTI-CRUISE MISSILE CASE

LD092049 Montreal International Service in English 2000 GMT 9 May 85

[Text]

The Supreme Court of Canada ruled today that the courts have the right to review government decisions if they infringe upon rights guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The decision grew out of a case brought before the court by a coalition of peace and nuclear disarmament groups. They claim that a Cabinet decision to allow the United States to test cruise missiles over northern Canada violates the part of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which guarantees Canadians the right to life, liberty, and security of person. According to the groups the tests increase the risk of nuclear war and so threaten the right to life. But the court dismissed the case, saying there is no link between the Cabinet decision on cruise testing and the growing risk of nuclear war. However, ruling on a broader principle, the Supreme Court said the executive branch of the government, the Cabinet, has a duty to act in accordance with the Rights Charter.

CSO: 5220/08

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

TASS REPORTS DEBATE ON NON-USE-OF-FORCE PROPOSAL

LD141534 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Stockholm June 14 TASS -- TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Stepanenko report:

Keen political debates have unfolded nowadays at the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe that is taking place in the Swedish capital over the socialist countries' proposal to conclude a treaty banning the use of military force.

The conclusion of such a treaty, the chief Soviet delegate, Ambassador at Large Oleg Grinevskiy, has stated, would be a manifestation of resolve on the part of the European countries, the USA and Canada to embrace a course of strengthening the foundations of peaceful cooperation. However, the policy of the USA and its closest NATO allies is an obstacle to this treaty. Although they had to agree to discuss the non-use of force on the proposal of the socialist countries, nothing so far shows that they intend to tackle that most important problem in all seriousness. Debates show that the United States has come to this session empty-handed again and that it is trying to make do with general rhetoric. That destructive approach, the Soviet delegate stressed, substantially holds back the progress of the Stockholm forum.

The arguments of the USA and its allies against the socialist countries' proposals on the non-use of force are unconvincing and look like attempts to avoid businesslike discussion. The U.S. delegate Lyn Hansen claimed, for instance, that the best manifestation of the states' obligation not to use force would be the adoption of NATO's measures. However, NATO's proposals for the most part are aimed at securing unilateral advantage for the North Atlantic alliance and at "X-raying" the structure and activity of the Armed Forces of the USSR and its allies to the detriment of their security but have nothing to do with the principle of the non-use of force. Statements by the West German delegate Klaus Zitron, who paid lip service to non-use of force, actually also boiled down to advertising NATO's proposals.

As the Bulgarian delegate, Ambassador S. Todorov, justly pointed out, those attempts of the NATO countries to substitute their narrow measures of a military-technical nature for the effective obligations on the non-use of military force could not be a solution of the problem that is expected from the conference by the peoples of Europe.

CSO: 5200/1268

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

SOVIET DELEGATE ISRAELYAN CITED

LD201747 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The idea that it is time to move on from words to deeds, to the elaboration of practical accords on many matters that are ripe for mutually-acceptable solutions is being persistently repeated in the first speeches at the resumed session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

Viktor Israelyan, the leader of the Soviet delegation, emphasized today that there exists a good basis for talks on matters aimed at preventing nuclear war and at achieving nuclear disarmament. With a constructive approach, it could be possible to coordinate already at this session a draft treaty on a total ban on nuclear weapons' testing, which would substantially limit possibilities for upgrading nuclear arms and would facilitate a reduction in nuclear arsenals and the consolidation of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Prior to concluding such a treaty, the Soviet Union is ready to announce a moratorium on any nuclear explosions and to introduce it from August 6, this year, i.e. on the day of the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing on Hiroshima, or maybe even earlier.

The speaker pointed out further that talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons have been given a substantial impulse this year. The outlines of possible accords on some aspects of a future convention have become visible. However, the decision by the U.S. House of Representatives to allocate 124.5 million dollars in the current year for the creation of chemical binary weapons deals a heavy blow on the talks. The U.S. decision cannot be regarded otherwise than Washington's new dangerous step in preparation for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

The leader of the Soviet delegation also pointed out that the U.S. line towards achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and its allies, and towards whipping up the arms race is the chief source of tension in the current international situation.

The exclusion of outer space from the sphere of the arms race should become a strictly observed norm of the states' policies, Viktor Israelyan went on to say. That would meet the vital interests of mankind and would be of immense importance for the lessening of the war threat and for general improvement of the international situation. The Soviet Union is sincerely interested in success of the talks with the USA on nuclear and space arms, and is hoping that the U.S. stand will be adjusted in the direction of constructiveness and businesslike approach.

On behalf of the socialist countries' group, David Meiszter (Hungary) has introduced a working document on the prohibition of radiological weapons and of attacks on nuclear facilities. The document reaffirms the constructive line of the socialist countries participating in the conference in this concrete item on the agenda as well.

CSO: 5200/1268

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

CZECH CHIEF NEGOTIATOR CRITICIZES NATO STANCE

AU131301 Paris AFP in English 1251 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Vienna, June 13 [AFP] -- Czechoslovakia today criticized the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for dragging its feet in negotiations here with Warsaw Pact nations on reducing conventional arms in central Europe.

Ludek Handl, chief Czechoslovak negotiator, said Warsaw Pact nations were still waiting for NATO's answer to a Soviet proposal made last February 14, calling for troop reductions of 13,000 U.S. soldiers and 20,000 Soviet soldiers.

NATO said at the last round of Mutual Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks here May 23 that it was carefully studying the offer.

One of the conflicts in the 12-year MBFR talks has been how to count troop reductions. NATO has offered on-site verification, which the Warsaw bloc has been hesitant to accept, charging this was espionage in disguise.

Mr. Handl said "the socialist countries did not deny or downgrade the significance of verification measures but opposed any exaggeration of their role and using them as an excuse for a lack of readiness to negotiate on the substance of the matter."

CSO: 5200/3060

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

BRIEFS

NEW ITALIAN DELEGATION HEAD (ANSA) Rome, June 21--The Italian cabinet today appointed General Luigi Poli new Army chief of staff replacing Gen Umberto Cappuzzo who is retiring. Gen Cappuzzo will head the permanent Italian delegation to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks in Europe up to December 31, 1985. The cabinet voiced "the government's highest recognition for Capuzzo's work in his more than 40-year career in the service of the country, in peace and in war." [Text] [Rome ANSA in English 1930 GMT 21 Jun 85 AU]

CSSR BLAMES WEST--Vienna June 13 TASS--A plenary meeting at the talks on mutual reduction of the armed forces and armaments in central Europe has been addressed by the head of the Czechoslovak delegation L. Handl. Touching upon the causes of the lack of progress at the talks, he pointed out that the obstructionist stand of the West was actually the reflection of the present-day military-political concept and the practical activities of the U.S. and its NATO allies which were at variance with the very objectives of the Vienna talks. The Czechoslovak representative pointed out the constructive character of the proposal of socialist countries of February 14, this year, that opened up a possibility of a real progress and the passing over from futile discussions to the practical reduction of military confrontation. He urged Western participants to respond positively to this proposal. [Text] [LD131418 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 13 Jun 85]

CSO: 5200/1268

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FURTHER SOVIET COMMENT ON U.S. BINARY-ARMS DECISION

New Arms Race

PM131421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by O. Lomov: "The Pentagon's Binary Passions"]

[Text] There has been discussion of the question of banning chemical weapons at the Geneva Disarmament Conference for several months, but it has made no headway. The reason for this is the stance of the United States and its NATO allies who are trying to deadlock these talks by any means and to start a new arms race spiral in this sphere, while accusing the USSR and the socialist countries of this.

The U.S. Administration has long been trying to start the large-scale rearmament of its armed forces with a new variety of chemical weapons -- binary weapons.

For this purpose Reagan is requesting from Congress the biggest sum in the whole postwar period, \$1.3 billion. In order to obtain the legislators' consent, the administration does not balk at any methods. Intimidation, graft, deception -- anything goes. Thus, addressing the House of Representatives' Foreign Affairs Committee recently, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger said without batting an eye: "In my opinion, there is no doubt that the Nicaraguans have received equipment for chemical warfare."

When congressmen asked the secretary to cite facts confirming this report, C. Weinberger simply avoided replying. Then the legislators turned to the most competent military organ, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for explanations. Its chairman, General Vessey, announced with military bluntness that "the United States has no proof that offensive chemical weapons have been supplied to Nicaragua, but in recent months U.S. intelligence has ascertained that some mobile decontamination means have appeared there." It is not known how the U.S. congressmen reacted to this admission, but probably such a reply amused them as an example of "military" logic.

Unintentionally, the general broached an extremely ticklish issue which U.S. officials usually prefer to pass over in silence. As is known, decontamination means are intended not to wage chemical warfare, but to neutralize toxic substances in the event of their use. For several years now gangs of counterrevolutionaries, trained and armed with U.S. dollars and supplied with the latest weapons, including chemical weapons, by the CIA and the Pentagon, have been waging an undeclared war against Nicaragua. According to information received, Sandinist units have repeatedly seized chemical weapons.

bearing the stamp "U.S.-made" during fighting with the Somozists. Probably the decontamination means the CIA sleuths allegedly saw in Nicaragua are actually destined to combat U.S. chemical weapons, which the "contras" are ready to use at any time under the leadership of U.S. instructors.

Ignorant people may, of course, marvel why such a responsible figure in the U.S. Administration as the defense secretary had to resort to distorting reality, or, to put it bluntly, to lying, and especially in such a prestigious gathering as a House of Representatives committee. It is easy to reply to this question if you know the existing methods and practice in the United States by which the administration extorts new appropriations for military programs from Congress.

This overt lie was needed by the Pentagon boss in order to intimidate the legislators with the "growth" in the USSR's military chemical might and the "significant U.S. lag" in the sphere of offensive chemical means and to make them vote for the expansion of the U.S. chemical rearmament program. This program envisages, in particular, the completion of construction of new production capacities for binary chemical weapons, their production, and the start of stockpiling.

So what is the Reagan administration trying to secure? Primarily a considerable increase in and substantial renewal of the U.S. chemical arsenal. According to Pentagon "strategists," even 5 million units of chemical ammunition, which is the amount of ammunition requested by the administration, will be "insufficient" for a future war. Incidentally, the stocks of chemical means of attack now in existence in the United States are already great. More than 150,000 metric tons of chemical ammunition, that is, over 3 million shells, mines, grenades, guided and unguided missiles, bombs, clusters, spraying [vylivnye] instruments, and other varieties of ammunition are currently stockpiled at U.S. depots scattered throughout the world, including some in Europe. These toxic substances are more than sufficient to destroy the entire population and all living things on our planet several times over.

General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, believes that binary ammunition could be used alongside nuclear weapons in the European theater of military operations, not only against the Warsaw Pact countries, but also, if the situation demands, on the territory of U.S. allies. General Otis, commander U.S. Ground Forces Europe, and Lieutenant General Donnelly, commander U.S. Air Force Europe, revealed these plans when they addressed the Senate Armed Services' Committee. According to them, it is proposed to deploy and use binary ammunition primarily on the European Continent.

The very fact of the existence of such plans shows that the Washington administration has not abandoned its intentions to continue chemical weapons production. These steps by Washington patently run counter to the feelings of the world public and the positions of most of the world's states, which unanimously advocate banning chemical weapons and destroying all their stockpiles. Not the expansion but the destruction of chemical arsenals -- this is the demand of all peace-loving people.

Commission Report

LD140452 Moscow TASS in English 0440 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 14 TASS--The commission to the President for the problems of chemical weapons has issued a report in which it "recommends" that preparation for chemical warfare be conducted at an accelerated pace. The "recommendations" fully coincided with the intentions of the administration on whose initiative the commission was set up ostensibly for the purpose of "independently" studying the questions of whether the United States needs modernising its chemical potential.

Consisting of such figures are Brzezinski and General Haig who are notorious for their militarist views, the commission arrived at a conclusion that the United States needs modernisation of the chemical arsenals, envisaging the setting up of the flow-line production of binary artillery shells, air bombs and rockets. The commission has agreed with the administration that at least 1,500 million dollars should be allocated for these purposes under a budget for the 1986 financial year. It was precisely this kind of support that the White House pressed for. At present the White House by using the commission's report as an "evidence of authoritative and independent specialists" will with fresh vigour try to put through Congress its request for funds for an accelerated preparation for chemical warfare.

Reagan Holds Closed Meeting

LD182023 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0250 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, 18 Jun (TASS)--President Reagan has held a closed meeting in the White House with members of the presidential chemical weapons committee, and also with a group of legislators who support stepping up Washington's preparations for the waging of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

The details of the meeting have not been reported. However, the White House has not tried to hide the fact that the main subject of the meeting was the question of how to push through Congress as quickly as possible a request for allocations of at least \$1.5 billion in the next fiscal year to build up the U.S. chemical warfare potential.

House Vote

LD201439 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0309 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, 20 Jun (TASS) -- TASS correspondent A. Lyutyy reports:

U.S. legislators have come out in favor of stepping up the chemical weapons arms race. The U.S. House of Representatives has voted to allocate \$124.5 million in the next financial year for the design and preparation of the production of a new in principle and particularly barbarous type of chemical weapon -- nerve-paralyzing binary munitions. The technical capacities for this have already been created at the U.S. Army's chemical complex at Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Although the House hedged its decision with a number of conditions -- particularly, the commencement of production of binary munitions is permitted only after 30 September, 1987, and only if NATO member-countries agree to them being stationed in Western Europe -- the representatives of the Pentagon themselves considered this a minor formality. The Senate voted earlier for the production of binary weapons and, as the U.S. military department believes, during the reaching of a "compromise" form of the legislation in the Congress conference committee, the conditions put forward by the House will be removed altogether.

The decision by the Senate and House of Representatives is a dangerous step along the path of U.S. preparations for waging chemical and bacteriological warfare.

For several years in a row, Congress refused administration requests to allocate funds for binary weapons. However, this time the "independent" legislators gave way under pressure from the very powerful lobbying campaign by the White House. The "independent" committee set up by President Reagan to force through his plans, which contained such hawks as former Secretary of State Haig and former presidential assistant on national security Brzezinski, has in recent weeks been frightening members of Congress with fabrications about "the growing chemical threat from the USSR." Only 2 days ago, the head of the administration himself "twisted the arms" of hesitating legislators in the White House. Defense Secretary Weinberger sent a letter to Capitol Hill which almost in a panic asserted that existing U.S. chemical weapons reserves are "insufficient."

That is a pure and ill-intentioned invention which has become necessary for Washington in untying its hands so as to unravel the arms race in yet another dangerous direction -- preparation for chemical and bacteriological war. Addressing Congress, John Porter, member of the House of Representatives, said that there are more than enough existing U.S. arsenals of chemical weapons. According to press data, the U.S. stocks of chemical weapons make up at the very least 150,000 tons, while the amount of ammunition is over 3 million items.

#### War Against Civilians Seen

LD202112 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 20 Jun 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Charikov]

[Text] According to a report from Washington, the House of Representatives has voted for allocating \$124.5 million to create and prepare for the production of a new type of chemical weapons, binary ammunition with a nerve paralyzing effect, next fiscal year. The technical facilities for that have already been created at the chemical complex of the U.S. Army in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Here is Yevgeniy Kachanov with more details:

The administration's representatives, including President Reagan himself and Secretary of Defense Weinberger, recently were literally twisting the arms of congressmen trying to persuade them of the supposed need to launch a new round of the arms race. One more pseudo-argument has been added to the old ones which in particular dealt with the growing chemical threat on the part of the Soviet Union -- that the binary weapons are allegedly safe to produce and handle.

Yes, this new type of chemical ammunition consists of two or more relatively nontoxic components which turn into a lethal cloud only when mixed. Yet, this is exactly where a most serious danger is concealed. What I mean is the fact that production of these components will be impossible to control even if a general treaty banning chemical weapons is concluded. Perhaps it is precisely this factor that is of special attraction to the hawks from the Pentagon who are bursting to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union by all means possible.

Indeed, American strategists in their chemical concepts start from the assumption that combat and toxic agents will give considerable tactical advantages to the side which uses them first against an enemy which is not prepared for chemical defense. This, as you can see, is in full accord with the American first strike strategy.

Now, another factor of considerable importance: Military specialists have made scrupulous calculations showing that under a wide-scale operation against the civil population, treatment of 1 square kilometer of land with the help of chemical weapons, in other words, total destruction of life on it, would be 2,000 times less costly to the United States than when other means of warfare are applied. Therefore, the relatively small -- by the Pentagon's measures -- allocation for modernizing the chemical stocks that has been allocated by the House of Representatives in fact means a threat to the life of many millions of people.

Even at present, in the opinion of American Senator David Pryor, the stocks of accumulated chemical weapons are sufficient for eliminating the whole population of our planet 50 times; however, this is not enough. A 5-year program of updating the chemical potential is now under way in the United States. From 1983 to 1987, up to \$10 billion are to be spent on it. Within the framework of this program, about 90 state and private firms are working for the Pentagon's needs. This entire production and financial might is serving one end -- to allow the United States to inflict a first strike.

It was no coincidence that an instruction from Defense Secretary Weinberger for 1985-89 gives the U.S. Armed Forces the direct task of being ready to make rapid use of the chemical weapons. That is exactly why Washington in the course of 50 years has categorically refused to ratify the Geneva protocol of 1925 banning the military use of toxic warfare substances. It is exactly why the present American Administration spares no effort in obstructing any steps of the world community aimed at outlawing the chemical weapons.

CSO: 5200/1255

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW: U.S. DISREGARDS GENEVA CHEMICAL WEAPONS PROTOCOL

LD171856 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Excerpts] The protocol banning the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons was signed in Geneva on 17 June 1925. About 100 countries acceded to it and the USSR was among the first. However, there was no signature by a U.S. representative on this document. Washington acceded to the protocol only in 1975, after it had committed its monstrous crimes in Indochina. As a result of the wide-scale chemical warfare unleashed by the U.S. leaders against the Vietnamese patriots about 2 million inhabitants of the region fell victim.

The United States has played and still plays a very important role in the development and preparation of chemical warfare. In acceding to the Geneva protocol, it seems that Congress formally forbade any future allocations for the production of chemical weapons. But how does Washington implement the Geneva protocol in reality? President Reagan has stated that stepping up the U.S. chemical arsenals is necessary in the national interests and in May 1982 Congress approved a program for U.S. chemical rearmament. The 5-year program will cost \$10 billion and the number of munitions will rise to 5 million.

The White House tries to justify its increase in chemical weapons arsenals by slander against the USSR and by referring to the military threat from Moscow. However, in reality this course is linked with the strategic plans of the U.S. leaders which are based on a simple principle: Chemical weapons are relatively cheap while their lethal power can be fully comparable with nuclear weapons.

What U.S. national interests demand new doses of toxic substances? If one looks at the map of the world, then the silent killers manufactured in the United States have appeared in Vietnam, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada, and Afghanistan. These names include all the hot spots of the globe where U.S. imperialism is conducting a course of terror in interstate relations and is striving to suppress the national liberation movement.

CSO: 5200/1255

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: FRG, GDR PARTIES CALL FOR ZONE FREE OF CHEMICAL ARMS

LD191934 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn June 19 TASS -- Representatives of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) and the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) have declared for creating a zone free of chemical arms in central Europe. It was stressed at a press conference here today, attended by Hermann Axen, a member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, and Karsten Dietrich Voigt, a member of the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and members of the two parties' working group on questions of disarmament in the field of chemical arms, that the move to free the European Continent of this monstrous type of mass destruction weapons would be an important contribution to reducing the arsenals of warfare toxic agents and would lessen the danger of unleashing a chemical war. Representatives of the SED and SPD condemned the steps which are being taken by the U.S. Administration to build up chemical arms and Washington's plans to start the production of the new type of this weapon -- binary chemical munitions.

Addressing the press conference, Hermann Axen drew attention to the socialist countries' readiness to take concrete measures to achieve disarmament in the field of chemical arms, which was manifest in the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty member states. Their efforts are aimed at ensuring a comprehensive and total ban of warfare toxic agents, he stressed.

H. Axen and K.D. Voigt submitted to the press conference a draft treaty on setting up a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe, which was drawn up by members of the two parties' working group. The draft treaty will be handed over to the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, and also to all other interested countries in the U.N. Committee on Disarmament.

CSO: 5200/1255

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

GDR, FRG PARTIES REACH CHEMICAL DISARMAMENT AGREEMENT

**Joint Communique**

**LD191907 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1143 GMT 19 Jun 85**

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jun (ADN) -- The text of the joint SED-SPD communique is as follows:

As a result of a talk on 14 March 1984 between Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, and Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the SPD Bundestag Group and deputy chairman of the SPD, a working group for exploring the possibilities for the creation of a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe was formed.

It consisted of, on behalf of the SED: Hermann Axen, Politburo member and secretary of the SED Central Committee; Dr Manfred Uschner, deputy director of an SED Central Committee department; Prof Karl Heinz Lohs, director of the Chemical Toxicology Research Department of the GDR Academy of Sciences; Karl-Heinz Wagner, member of the staff of the SED Central Committee; Klaus-Dieter Ernst, section chief in the GDR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and on behalf of the SPD: Karsten D. Voigt, chairman of the Working Group for Chemical Disarmament, chairman of the Working Group for Foreign Policy of the SPD Bundestag Group, member of the SPD Bundestag Group Executive Committee and of the SPD Executive Committee; Egon Bahr, chairman of the Subcommittee for Disarmament and Arms Control in the German Bundestag and member of the SPD Presidium; Dr Hermann Scheer, chairman of the Working Group for Disarmament and Arms Control of the SPD Bundestag Group and member of the SPD Council; and Dr Uwe Stehr, expert on disarmament and arms control of the SPD Bundestag Group.

The working group met six times. As a result, a "Framework for an Agreement on the Establishment of a Zone Free of Chemical Weapons in Europe," which the SED Politburo, on the proposal of Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee; and the SPD Presidium, on the proposal of Willy Brandt, SPD Chairman, Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the SPD Bundestag Group, reviewed, has been approved.

The working group was guided in its consultations by the obligations formulated in Article 5 of the Basic Treaty and by the responsibility of those involved to the effect that war should never again emanate from German soil and that instead peace must issue from German soil.

The agreement represents a framework for government negotiations and is intended to promote and encourage negotiations by the governments, which it cannot replace.

The two sides are convinced that they have thus created conditions for the achievement of a treaty on a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe within the foreseeable future. The two sides are convinced that such a zone will assist the Geneva negotiations on a global ban on chemical weapons and will constitute an important step for the concrete progress of detente, disarmament and confidence for the establishment of joint security in Europe.

The two sides have agreed to submit the results of their work

- to the governments of their states,
- to make them available to interested governments and parties,
- to present them to the United Nations, and especially to the Geneva disarmament conference.

The two sides have agreed to continue the talks on arms limitation and disarmament and explore in particular proposals for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Europe in accordance with the suggestion of the Palme Commission.

Signed: H. Axen

#### Text of Draft Agreement

LD192204 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1151 GMT 19 Jun 85

[ "Framework for an Agreement on the Establishment of a Zone Free From Chemical Weapons in Europe" -- ADN headline]

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jun (ADN) -- The text of the draft for an agreement on the creation of a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe is as follows:

#### Preamble

In the endeavor to counter the arms race and the resulting danger to peace in Europe and the world, in time and effectively, and to bring about gradual and stable joint security at the lowest possible level of arms and armed forces,

Concerned at the dangers deriving from chemical weapons that exist at present and at the new developments in weapons technology in these weapons of mass destruction, which would create new dimensions of the threat to mankind and make disarmament agreements considerably more difficult,

Determined to achieve a comprehensive and worldwide ban on chemical weapons and to promote the realization of this goal through regional measures,

In the intention of returning to detente through arms limitation and disarmament, the states concerned conclude the following treaty in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Helsinki Final Act:

1. A zone free from chemical weapons will be established in Europe.

#### Extent of the Zone

2. a) The extent of this zone should at first encompass central Europe as defined by the states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact for the Vienna negotiations (Belgium, the CSSR, the GDR, the FRG, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the PPR). The zone is open for the entry of further states.
- b) The chemical weapon-free zone shall at least encompass the GDR, the FRG and the CSSR. Such a zone, directly on the dividing line between the two alliance systems in Central Europe, represents a first, particularly urgent measure for liberating Europe from chemical weapons.

#### Obligations

3. The states whose territories are in the zone commit themselves to freeing it or keeping it free from chemical weapons.
4. They commit themselves neither to produce chemical weapons nor to acquire them, nor to allow other states to deploy them or produce them on their territory or to transport them through their territory.
5. They appeal to those states that have armed forces in this region and that possess chemical weapons to free or keep free the relevant zone from chemical weapons within a time to be determined and not to deploy any such weapons in this zone in the future, and not to produce them or hand them over and introduce them to the countries belonging to the zone.
6. They appeal to those states that maintain armed forces in this zone and possess chemical weapons not to stockpile the chemical weapons to be withdrawn in states that border on the zone and do not possess chemical weapons.
7. They appeal to those states that possess chemical weapons, urging them to commit themselves to respect the status of the chemical weapons-free zone and never to use chemical weapons against chemical weapon-free territory or to threaten to use them.

#### Phases

8. The zone free from chemical weapons will be established in two phases:
  - a) Liberation of the zone from chemical weapons where these are present,
  - b) Keeping the zone free from chemical weapons.

#### Control

#### 9. Principles

The effective control of the treaty commitments will be said down on the basis of the principles adopted by consensus in the final document of the UN's first special disarmament session.

Accordingly, agreements must guarantee the right of every state to security and ensure that at no stage an individual state or a group of states can be at an advantage vis-a-vis other states. This includes:

-- The extent and nature of the monitoring must be adequate for the extent of the disarmament measures.

-- National monitoring has precedence over international.

#### 10. Tasks

The aim of the treaty is the complete freeing of the relevant zone of chemical weapons. It would be appropriate to accomplish it progressively, in phases. The monitoring, which will be carried out with national and international verification processes, must correspond with this; it will relate to the presence and/or absence of chemical weapons and to the fact that such weapons should not be brought into the zone. These verification measures also apply to chemical weapons that could still be developed.

#### 11. Instruments of verification

##### a) National verification

Each party to the treaty uses or creates his national means of verification and takes the necessary internal state measures to ensure adherence to the treaty commitments. The parties to the treaty exchange information and experience on their national monitoring.

##### b) International Verification

Verification will be conducted by a permanent international commission. All states involved in the commitments on the chemical weapon-free zone acquire the right to become members of this commission and thus to monitor the zone. The participating states commit themselves, for the solution of the problems that arise in carrying out these commitments, to cooperate with the permanent international commission and to support it in its work.

#### 12. Implementation of International Verification

a) The governments of the states involved assume the responsibility for abiding by the commitments entered into in all phases.

b) In addition, where suspicion of infringement of the treaty arises the permanent international commission is called in. Reasons must be given for such a complaint.

c) If the causes of the suspicion are not eliminated within a period to be laid down, on-the-spot inspections will be conducted by the permanent international commission.

d) Details of the statutes governing the modus operandi and rights of the permanent international commission, including verification, on-the-spot inspections on demand, the periods, the exchange of information and the title of the permanent international commission, are to be determined in negotiations.

#### Relationship to Other Treaties

13. a) The treaty on the creation of a chemical weapon-free zone does not affect the membership of the parties to the treaty of their political and military alliances.

b) The parties to the treaty will enter into a comprehensive and worldwide agreement on the banning of chemical weapons.

Duration of the Treaty

14. The treaty is valid until all states involved in a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe have entered into a comprehensive and worldwide convention banning chemical weapons. Treaty conferences will be held every 5 years to take into account experiences and new technological and scientific developments.

Final Provisions

15. The governments of the participating states agree and publish the exchange of identical notes stating that there is no production of chemical warfare agents in their territories and there will not be any in future.

16. In accordance with international practice, among other things the need for ratification, coming into force and deposition will be regulated.

Press Conference

LD191933 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1130 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jun (ADN) -- After nuclear weapons, chemical weapons pose the greatest threat to the life of mankind.

This was said by Hermann Axen on 19 June in his introductory remarks to journalists from many countries in the federal press conference room in Bonn. The SED and SPD have therefore seized a political initiative to create a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe. Hermann Axen quoted Erich Honecker, who last week reaffirmed that the world has reached a point that places great responsibility on all states -- large, medium-sized, and small.

Chemical weapons are an especially gruesome category of weapons of mass destruction whose deployment is banned by the 1925 Geneva Protocol, said Hermann Axen. Nevertheless, huge stocks of this weapon exist today. Many thousands of metric tons of them are stored in Europe, ready for operation. Their use would bring agonizing death or continual suffering to millions of people and render our world uninhabitable.

Even in times of peace, technical defects can have catastrophic consequences, as the catastrophes of Seveso and Bhopal showed. As if this were not enough, the United States is producing a qualitatively new generation of chemical weapons of mass destruction, the binary chemical warfare agent, according to official statements of the administration. It is an urgent necessity to eliminate this terrible weapon from our earth forever. Therefore, said Axen, we fully support a worldwide ban on chemical weapons at the Geneva disarmament conference. We also work for regional steps in eliminating these chemical weapons. The documents set out at the press conference clearly take into account the close relationship between the worldwide ban on chemical weapons and regional agreements. The creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe would counter the escalation of chemical weapons. People would breathe a sigh of relief.

Hermann Axen pointed out that the documents worked out by the SED and SPD do not call into question the membership of any state in the respective alliance systems. The security interests of all states are fully guaranteed. The agreement achieved by the two parties is addressed to the signatory states of the Helsinki Final Act. To make progress, a chemical weapons-free zone could initially include central Europe

as defined by the NATO and Warsaw Pact states for the Vienna negotiations -- Belgium, the CSSR, the GDR, the FRG, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the PPR. Naturally the zone would be open to other states. It should at least include the GDR, the FRG, and the CSSR, states situated on the dividing line between the two alliance systems.

The documents contain clear statements on principles, tasks, and instruments of national and international control, Hermann Axen continued. The SED and SPD support effective national and international control with a scope and character matching the scope of the disarmament measure. States prepared to enter into negotiations on the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe should say so publicly through their governments. It would be advantageous for reaching an agreement and for the immediate prevention of dangers emanating from chemical weapons if the concerned states pledge, until the reaching of an agreement, that no further or new chemical warfare agents will be produced or permitted to be deployed on their territory by other states. This applies in particular to arms modernization in chemical binary weapons.

The agreement between the SED and SPD should promote government negotiations but not replace or anticipate them. As far as the start of such negotiations is concerned, said the speaker, we are confident that a strong movement is developing in many European countries to free the continent of chemical weapons.

Hermann Axen recalled letters from Julius Lehlbach, chairman of the DGB regional association in Rhineland Palatinate, to Konstantin Chernenko, Gustav Husak, and Erich Honecker -- letters that generally received a positive response. In its reply, the USSR stated its determination to support the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons and to respect and guarantee it.

Erich Honecker's letter expressed support for all sensible proposals to achieve a zone free of chemical weapons in Europe.

The fact that DGB Chairman Ernst Breit spoke in favor of the creation of such a zone with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl is well known.

By being part of a zone free of chemical weapons, the two German states could make a practical step towards ensuring that war will never again emanate from German soil. This would help to create a climate favorable to other negotiations. Peace is the most important asset, and preserving and strengthening it is the predominant issue, said Hermann Axen. Peace has always been an ideal and militant goal of the working class movement, today more than ever. The SED therefore supports a worldwide coalition of reason and realism.

Speaking for the SPD, Karsten Voigt said that the aim of the talks with the SED was to work out a model, showing that in a framework of security, partnership, and detente it is possible to solve in principle previously controversial security policy issues. A breakthrough was reached because both sides want success and, in view of existing and potential chemical weapons, are striving to reduce the resulting threat to central Europe. Karsten Voigt expressed the hope that the result of the negotiations between the two parties will be taken into consideration at the discussions currently underway in the U.S. House of Representatives on the production of so-called binary chemical weapons, and will help prevent a decision in favor of beginning production.

Yesterday the SPD informed the Federal Government of the outcome of the joint work with the SED and handed it the documents, said Karsten Voigt. The outcome of the work is a piece of practiced partnership based on shared responsibility. It is based on common interest in the reduction of tensions, greater security in Europe, and thus on the

contents of Article 5 of the Basic Treaty. The head of the SPD delegation thanked the SED representatives in the working group for their businesslike, at times difficult, but constructive cooperation. No one lost out here; rather, everyone gained something, and if the model is put into practice, an example of detente and genuine growth in security will emanate from the center of Europe.

Responding to questions from journalists, Hermann Axen said that the SED's participation in the joint initiatives is an expression of the fact that the struggle to eliminate chemical weapons assumes paramount position in the GDR's efforts for peace and disarmament. In the forefront of these efforts are the great issues, so vital for everyone, that are presently the subject of negotiations between the USSR and the United States in Geneva: prevention of the militarization of space and ending the nuclear arms race on earth. However, the elimination of chemical weapons should not wait until these questions are solved. Moving forward in this direction would help create a climate of trust and have a beneficial effect on other negotiations on arms limitation.

Karsten Voigt praised the result of the talks, held for nearly a year, as an important contribution by both parties not only to eliminating chemical weapons, but to preserving peace in general. The negotiations did not always proceed smoothly or without controversy. What was decisive, however, was that there is now an agreement aimed at rendering a large area of Europe free of chemical weapons. This is a good step and a good beginning.

Asked why the SED and SPD seized this joint initiative, Hermann Axen answered that the struggle for peace is not a matter for only one party or state. It requires fair cooperation by all people interested in peace, from different camps and with different ideologies, since there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence. The SED believes that uniting communist, social-democratic, and socialist parties on matters of peace and disarmament has great influence on governmental policy and the development of the international situation.

The SED agrees with the concept of security partnership used by the Social Democrats, Hermann Axen said in response to a question. It is in line with what the GDR means by equality and equal security. Today there can be no security against one another, only with each other. This requires readiness for acceptable compromises.

Karsten Voigt announced that the SPD has already briefed the Federal Chancellor's Office and the Foreign Ministry on the results of the talks and has handed over the text of the agreements. It is assumed that the Federal Government will examine it carefully and then make a statement on it. In view of the importance of the documents, information has also been sent to the U.S. Administration. The parties to the Socialist International will be informed at the bureau meeting currently being held in Stockholm.

Hermann Axen announced that at the appropriate time the GDR will also directly approach the Federal Government through the normal diplomatic channels and propose the start of government negotiations.

Egon Bahr, member of the SPD Presidium, welcomed this statement and stressed that the SPD is determined, upon assuming government office in the Federal Republic, to undertake as one of its first steps an initiative on the creation of zones free of chemical weapons, in line with the submitted draft.

Hermann Axen told the journalists that the SED has continually informed the GDR's alliance partners on the progress of the consultations, which after all affect the security of all fraternal states. He stressed that the Warsaw Pact states adopt a positive stance on the SED-SPD initiative, in the spirit of its appeal of 10 January 1984.

Turning to questions by various press representatives on the provision of control measures, Hermann Axen, Karsten Voigt, and Egon Bahr explained in detail the mechanisms provided for, which are a combination of national and international controls.

Egon Bahr stressed that he will be very pleased if the adopted model promotes and gives further impetus to negotiations on an agreement on the worldwide elimination of chemical weapons. If such an agreement is signed in Geneva, he will be willing to immediately replace something good with something better.

At the end of the press conference, Hermann Axen again praised the success of the jointly achieved work. Since the SED and SPD are parties with different programs and ideologies and since their states belong to different alliance systems, it is all the more important that they have made a great step forward on an issue as decisive as the elimination of a dangerous weapon of mass destruction that threatens Europe.

#### **Further Explanation of Agreement**

LD192254 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1219 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 19 Jun (ADN).-- The following explanation was published concerning the framework agreement:

A. The urgency of achieving a ban of chemical weapons justifies a parallel approach: To seek a world wide ban at the Geneva disarmament conference while simultaneously taking regional steps towards this ultimate goal. In addition to existing chemical weapons there are developments giving cause for concern, which on the one hand intensify the mass destruction impact of these weapons and on the other bring about a new offensive capability and may encourage active use on the battlefield, also by means of psycho-active and nonlethal agents.

Chemical weapons affect the unprotected civilian population far more than they do the armed forces. Their use on densely populated areas is particularly devastating.

A potential area for the use of chemical weapons would be in particular the region in which chemical weapons are stored and is a potential deployment area for new chemical weapons -- the center of Europe.

A zone comprised of a limited geographical area along either side of the line dividing the two military alliances would already significantly lower the probability of chemical weapons being used in Europe. This would make the establishment of a chemical weapon-free zone a step of arms limitation and disarmament and a major confidence-building measure as well. It would enhance the effectiveness of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

Regional measures can and should make use of the preliminary work done in connection with a global ban. Conversely, the experience gained may favorably influence the negotiations for a general ban. Regional measures can be implemented more easily because fewer states would be affected in a limited geographical area. They would be conducive to the achievement of a worldwide ban if, as in certain parts of Europe, particularly large quantities of chemical weapons are stockpiled. Compared to a global ban, regional measures permit concentration on withdrawal. With a global agreement, the destruction of chemical weapons would be a protracted process.

Regional measures would make it possible to implement the removal of chemical weapons and keeping clear the relevant zones clear, making verification within shorter periods easier. As things stand, regional measures would make a war with chemical weapons in Europe practically impossible.

Chemical weapons are military agents using toxic chemical compounds as warfare agents ... order to kill a person or disable him temporarily or permanently. Chemical warfare agents differ considerably in their toxicity and their mode of action (e.g. nerve poisons, skin poisons, psychoagents etc).

Further negotiations must clarify whether chemical warfare agents shall be deemed to include chemicals primarily used militarily to destroy or inflict long-term damage on the human environment (environmental warfare).

Among the currently stockpiled agents the most dangerous are phosphororganic esters, e.g. Sarin, Soman, as well as the V or VX toxins.

The characteristic feature of binary toxins is that two preliminary stages of relatively low toxicity of the chemical warfare agent are housed in separate containers of the projectiles (grenades, rockets). It is only when the projectile has been fired and is flying towards the target area that the two components are mixed. The highly toxic agent is then formed in a spontaneous chemical reaction.

C. 1. A data bank on scientific and technical questions of banning chemical weapons shall be set up at the permanent international commission. All states participating in the obligations of the chemical weapon-free zone will cooperate in this commission.

2. At the permanent international commission there will be reciprocal notifications of finds of chemical ammunition dating back to the two world wars and technical experience will be exchanged concerning the destruction of such finds of toxic agents.

3. The permanent international commission will develop common principles of law for the cross-border transport of dangerous commodities and will disclose on an annual basis all infringements noted by the national monitoring agencies (customs, transport police).

4. In addition to the periodic treaty conference, a scientific colloquium will be held annually on problems relating to the banning of chemical weapons. It will take place by rotation in the participating states of the chemical weapon-free zone.

CSO: 5200/3061

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS REPORTS BULGARIAN CALL FOR BALKAN NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

LD131646 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Sofia, June 13, TASS--A nuclear-free future for the Balkans is a real aim, says the commentary issued here by the SOFIA PRESS news agency. Bulgaria has expressed readiness to sign with the neighbour countries bilateral agreements on goodneighbourly relations, on renunciation of territorial claims, preventing the use of the territory of the contracting parties with hostile aims.

Bulgaria has declared its readiness to be the organiser and the venue for the holding of a meeting of the leaders of the Balkan states. One of the stages in preparing such a meeting was a meeting of experts of the Balkan countries in Athens in February 1984, which was convened on the proposal of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece. The participants in the conference discussed problems in connection with the turning of the peninsula into a zone free from nuclear weapons.

Facts indicate that the striving of the Balkan countries for peace and good-neighbourliness is stronger than the attempts made by the reactionary circles of the USA and NATO at frustrating a dialogue on that subject, the commentary says. The Soviet Union has already declared its preparedness to respect the status of the future nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. The creation of such a zone is a process, which will, undoubtedly, take much time. The very fact that it has already got under way is significant, the commentary stresses in conclusion.

CSO: 5200/1253

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT GROUP PUSHING NORDIC 'ZONE'

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 May 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Strategy for Insecurity"]

[Text] We have hardly had time to celebrate the longest period of peace in Europe in many generations before the organization No to Nuclear Weapons is planning its annual summer camp on Tromøya, where they will tell the people how insecure we all are. No sooner have the Western medium-range missiles been deployed without anything dramatic happening than No to Nuclear Weapons is attacking new projects. At this year's summer camp the chief concern is a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Scandinavia.

It is far from accidental that this disarmament movement has now woken to extraordinary activity. We have a Storting election in a few months, the security policy has for the first time in living memory become a prominent subject in the election campaign, and opportunities are being offered to pressure parties and individual politicians through extraparliamentary campaigns. We have extremely little fondness for such attempts to manipulate relations between the politician and voter, a form of action which saw the light of day at the beginning of the 1970's and which on several occasions has impeded a healthy political decision-making process.

Before last year's summer camp on Tromøya we dared to hope that the disarmament people would use as a basis the fundamental elements of Norwegian security policy, first and foremost, solidarity in NATO, which gave us the security we celebrated on 8 May. We expressed this hope because No to Nuclear Weapons pleads that it is not a no-to-NATO movement.

Nevertheless, our hope was in vain. The "Treaty Now" campaign suddenly sprang forth with No to Nuclear Weapons as the umbrella organization. This campaign has set itself the goal of bringing about a treaty-secured nuclear-weapons-free zone in Scandinavia as soon as possible and--it is in the cards--regardless of what our NATO alliance partners might think of the issue. The substance of No to Nuclear Weapons' no position on NATO membership must be doubted when the solidarity which is the main basis of the alliance is opposed. In other words, No to Nuclear Weapons' strategy goes farther than what the very Labor Party's Deputy Chairman Einar Førde so boldly called "infighting in NATO."

A joint Scandinavian offensive strategy to get this zone established has been announced before this year's summer camp. The strategy is to be worked out by the participants in the camp, we have learned. The decision has been made to do this before hearing the views of the number of politicians who have been invited to make speeches at the summer camp. Is it inconceivable to No to Nuclear Weapons that some of these politicians can come with arguments which lend themselves to correcting this "offensive strategy?" Or is the intention--as we suggested--that it is the solely the politicians who are to be corrected?

Since the last summer camp the new event has occurred that the Soviet Union has returned to the negotiating table in Geneva. However, the Kremlin still has the will and a certain ability to sow discord in the Western World, and we have to declare that No to Nuclear Weapons is making its contribution; the summer camp's activists seem not to have understood the simple fact that the arms reduction talks in Geneva can be completed with positive results only if the Western alliance stands united behind a common plan.

Those of the summer camp's participants who really /are/ [in italics] supporters of the Western defense alliance should take this seriously. It has long since been fruitless to give reasonable advice to the dominant core of No to Nuclear Weapons' NATO opponents.

8985  
CSO: 5200/2629

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND'S LANGE ON ANZUS SUPPORT

HK160514 Hong Kong Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 16 Jun 85

[Text] The New Zealand prime minister, Mr David Lange, has said that his country will continue to support the ANZUS alliance. However, he believes that early progress in the dispute over port calls by American Navy nuclear ships is unlikely. Mr Lange said American refusals to cooperate with New Zealand because of his government's ships ban were counterproductive. He said the ANZUS alliance, made up of Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, serves American interests directly, and he said America and New Zealand had too much in common for the disagreement to linger unresolved.

CSO: 5200/4335

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

PRAVDA ON AUSTRALIAN ANTINUCLEAR BILLS--Sydney, 4 Jan--The Australian Democratic Party has submitted six draft laws for examination by the upper chamber of the country's parliament. They provide for a ban on flights in Australian air space by aircraft carrying nuclear weapons and the refusal of entry to the country's territorial waters to nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear weapons. The draft laws are aimed also at preventing the introduction of nuclear weapons onto Australian soil and at banning the export of nuclear raw material from the country and the import to Australia of machinery and facilities used in nuclear production. Thus the "antinuclear package," as these draft laws are called here, is aimed against the Pentagon's use of Australian territory. The democrats' initiative relies on dozens of petitions and appeals which the deputies of both chambers received during the last sitting. [Dispatch by own correspondent O. Skalkin: "Antinuclear Package"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 85 First Edition p 1 PM]

TASS ON MANITOBA NFZ--Ottawa, June 13, TASS--The legislative assembly of Manitoba unanimously voted to proclaim that province in the west of Canada a zone free from nuclear weapons. Manitoba is the first Canadian province to make this initiative. The resolution was put to the vote by Manitoba Premier Howard Pawley, the leader of the New Democratic Party of the province. Pawley expressed the hope that Manitoba's decision will serve an example for other Canadian provinces and for the federal government. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 13 Jun 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/1253

NUCLEAR TESTING

U.S., USSR VIEWS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS COMPARED

PM190850 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "Commentator's Column": "What 'Restraint'?" ]

[Text] The U.S. Department of Energy recently held the latest underground tests of two nuclear devices in Nevada. The direct link between improving nuclear charges and cranking up the machinery of the arms race is obvious. That is why the echo of the explosions in Nevada again recalled the persistent need for a rapid resolution of the problem of a total ban on nuclear weapons tests. It is hardly necessary to prove that this measure would be an effective obstacle to the creation of increasingly destructive types of weapons and, consequently, to raising to a qualitatively new level the race in means of mass destruction. In this regard the growing support that the idea for a total ban on nuclear tests is receiving worldwide, including in the United States, is no surprise.

As the Democrat Representative P. Schroeder of Colorado recently reported at a press conference, she submitted a resolution calling on the U.S. President to introduce a moratorium on all nuclear weapons tests without exception for examination by the House of Representatives. This proposal was approved by over 150 influential public groups in the country. The resolution of the House Foreign Affairs Committee calling on the administration to embark on talks with the USSR on concluding a treaty on the complete and total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests was also a graphic reflection of the mood of many Americans. A similar draft law was adopted by the Senate last year.

As for the Soviet Union, its stance on the question of tests is well known. The USSR favors the immediate resumption of the trilateral Soviet-U.S.-British talks on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, which were broken off by the United States in 1980. It also favors the declaration by all states with nuclear weapons of moratoriums on nuclear explosions with effect from an agreed date and continuing through the conclusion of a treaty.

However, official Washington is avoiding reaching agreement on this point in every possible way, hypocritically referring to the "impossibility" of verification, and so forth. These reservations clearly demonstrate the stubborn U.S. reluctance to give up testing new nuclear charges.

The administration's stance shows for the umpteenth time that the widely publicized declarations of its desire to promote an "atmosphere of mutual restraint" have nothing in common with Washington's real intentions and actions. The very same course of undermining and sidestepping the system of restrictions in the arms sphere, a course of further building up strategic nuclear forces, is obvious.

CSO: 5200/1257

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS SEES U.S. POLICIES AS EVIDENCE OF WAR PLANS

LD131755 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

As a spokesman for the U.S. Energy Department said in Washington, another two underground blasts of nuclear devices with a yield of from 20 to 150 kilotons were conducted in a proving range in Nevada State. According to the UPI news agency, both blasts were conducted within the framework of the programme implemented in the USA for the development of new types of nuclear weapons. These facts vividly reflect the Reagan administration's strategy and policy. Instead of ending the build-up of such weapons and advance, on the basis of mutual agreement with the Soviet Union, on the way of reducing the existing nuclear weapons stocks, the American leaders are trying to find all sorts of loopholes in the existing international and bilateral agreements in order to create ever more perfect mass destruction nuclear weapons.

As is known, there is the understanding between the USSR and the USA on not holding nuclear weapons tests with a yield of more than 150 kilotons, about which appropriate official statements were made in 1976. This is the highest limit, and it is inadvisable to approach it, if one is guided by the striving to limit and reduce the nuclear potentials.

Yet the Reagan administration is literally balancing on the verge of the highest limit for creating and modernising new types of nuclear weapons. This is precisely the way they in Washington interpret the agreements on the limitation of nuclear potentials and overstep them as soon as they become an obstacle in the way of the arms race. That is why they act so vis-a-vis the ABM Treaty of 1972 and SALT-2.

It is also astonishing that none other than President Reagan himself said, when announcing his "star wars" programme, which was presented as a "Strategic Defence Initiative", that the programme would make the nuclear weapons unnecessary and obsolete.

One cannot help asking in this connection why then perfect and increase their nuclear potential? How can one tally what Reagan says with what he does? This is, undoubtedly, incompatible. The seven underground nuclear tests in Nevada, including a 150 kiloton blast, are evidence of the insincerity and falsehood of the promises given by the current administration on the questions of the limitation of the nuclear weapons race.

A stable and obvious stereotype has already shaped in the actions of the U.S. Administration: While declaring by word of mouth for disarmament, it embarked, in real fact, on the path of creeping out of the agreements, throwing away one after another the

limitations curbing the arms race, and is ready to amputate what becomes an obstacle for the programmes for the creation and build-up of the strategic weapons. It acts this way towards the ABM Treaty of 1972, which the administration has been maliciously undermining for a long time, has thrown away the protocol on SALT-2 on the limitation of long-range cruise missiles. The American side shall not be under a delusion as to what it will be allowed to determine according to its arbitrary rule, what commitments will be observed, and what will not be.

Washington refused to ratify the treaty between the USSR and the USA signed in Moscow in the summer of 1974 on the limitation of underground tests and it has not been put into effect until now. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union strictly abides by the understanding reached on this issue and repeatedly proposed to go even farther -- to reach agreement on a complete and general ban on the nuclear weapons tests.

Such a draft treaty was tabled by the Soviet delegation at the 30th session of the U.N. General Assembly and received broad support of the world public, while the USA and its military allies are departing from a practical resolution of this issue.

In contributing to building up an atmosphere of confidence, the USSR unilaterally committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons way back at the second special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament way back in the summer of 1982. Three years have passed but the U.S. Administration refuses to follow the USSR's example. All this indicates that Washington pursues directly opposite aims -- it is intensively preparing for nuclear war.

CSO: 5200/1257

NUCLEAR TESTING

LANGE CRITICIZES FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

HK111404 Hong Kong AFP in English 1333 GMT 11 Jun 15

[Text] Wellington, June 11 (AFP) -- France seems impervious to logical reason, Prime Minister David Lange said today after another underground nuclear explosion was recorded at the French South Pacific test site on Mururoa Atoll. New Zealand Government seismologists earlier confirmed that France had exploded a one-kilotonne device in an underground test. The detonation was recorded by seismographs at Rarotonga in the Cook Islands at 5:40 a.m. Saturday New Zealand time (1740 GMT Friday).

It was the fourth underground nuclear explosion at Mururoa in the past six weeks and the 71st since underground testing began in 1975. "We are not trying to strike a blow at France's national pride. We are facing the facts," Mr Lange said in a statement attacking the French underground explosion. "There is absolutely no sense in continuing to add to the world's nuclear weaponry".

Among the four underground explosions triggered in this latest series, France has tested a 150-kilotonne device, the biggest ever exploded underground at Mururoa Atoll.

CSO: 5200/4335

NUCLEAR TESTING

BRIEFS

PRAVDA REPORTS NEVADA TESTS--San Francisco, 14 Jun--The United States has conducted an underground test of two nuclear devices at a Nevada test range. According to a UPI report, both tests are linked with the program for developing new types of nuclear weapons. A spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy stated that the power of the explosions was between 20 and 150 kilotons and up to 20 kilotons, respectively. The United States has announced the detonation of 7 nuclear devices since the start of this year and there have been 637 such explosions at the Nevada test range since 1951, when the United States embarked on the implementation of an extensive program to build up its nuclear potential. [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 85 First Edition p 5]

STOCKHOLM REPORTS SOVIET TEST--The Soviet Union has again detonated a powerful explosive charge in the area of Semipalatinsk. According to the observatory in Hägfors, the explosion was registered at 7.2 on the Richter scale. So far 13 nuclear explosions have been effected this year: 3 by the Soviet Union, 4 by France and 6 by the United States. [Text] [LD152022 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 2000 GMT 15 Jun 85]

END

CSO: 5200/1257